



**FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE**

Daily Report

Supplement

Near East & South Asia

***INDIA/PAKISTAN:
KASHMIR: Press Reaction***

**FBIS-NES-94-055-S
Tuesday
22 March 1994**

Near East & South Asia SUPPLEMENT

INDIA/PAKISTAN:

KASHMIR: Press Reaction

FBIS-NES-94-055-S

CONTENTS

22 March 1994

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

INDIAN VIEWS

* Kashmiri Hindus Urge Return of Multi-Ethnic Society [INDIAN EXPRESS 10 Jan]	1
* Paper Ponders Change in Pakistan Attitude Toward Talks [INDIAN EXPRESS 20 Jan]	1
* Kashmir Said Only Homeland of Pandits [ORGANISER 23 Jan]	2
* U.S. Growing Interest in Kashmir Questioned [AJ 24 Jan]	3
* U.S. Stance on Kashmir Seen Hostile [JANSATTA 25 Jan]	4
* Daily Defends Delhi's Kashmir Proposals to Pakistan [NAVBHARAT TIMES 26 Jan]	5
* Changes in U.S. Policy Towards Kashmir Seen Worrisome [JANSATTA 27 Jan]	5
* Editorial Criticizes U.S. Reaction to Kashmir Issue [ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA 28 Jan]	7
* U.S. Blamed for Aggravating Misunderstanding With Pakistan [PATRIOT 28 Jan]	7
* Editorial Criticizes Pakistani 'Mischief' in Kashmir [NAVBHARAT TIMES 29 Jan]	8
* Refugee Camps, Suffering of Kashmiri Pandits Recounted [SUNDAY 5 Feb]	9
* Congress(I) Seen Unable To Defend National Interest [ORGANISER 30 Jan]	16
* Murli Joshi Interviewed on Kashmir Solution [ORGANISER 30 Jan]	18
* Chavan Discusses Pakistani Disinformation [INDIAN EXPRESS 31 Jan]	19
* Government Policy Faulted in Kashmir [JANSATTA 1 Feb]	20
* Dialogue With Kashmiri Militants Urged [THE TELEGRAPH 1 Feb]	20
* 'Conspiracy' To Embarrass India Over Kashmir [THE HINDU 2 Feb]	22
* Pakistan Said To Blackmail U.S. on Kashmir [THE HINDU 3 Feb]	22
* U.S. Intentions on Kashmir Issue Questioned [JANSATTA 4 Feb]	24
* Article Proposes Solution to Kashmir Problem [INDIAN EXPRESS 5 Feb]	25
* Editorial Asks if Pakistan Seeks War Over Kashmir [PUNJAB KESARI 7, 8 Feb]	26
* Commentary on Pakistan's 'Nefarious Game Plan' in Kashmir [Delhi Radio]	28
* Tension With Pakistan Over Kashmir Said Increasing [ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA 10 Feb]	29
* Commentary Views Pakistani Occupied Kashmir [THE STATESMAN 11, 12 Feb]	29
* U.S. Comparison of Kashmir, Afghanistan Criticized [DECCAN HERALD 12 Feb]	32
* Peoples League Party Leader Fears Disintegration [DECCAN HERALD 12 Feb]	32
* Pakistan Said Using Kashmir To Aggravate Tensions Nationwide [JANSATTA 12 Feb]	33
* U.S. Said To View Kashmir Crisis as Basis for Intervention [THE TELEGRAPH 14 Feb]	34
* Gill Ready With Strategy for Kashmir [DECCAN CHRONICLE 14 Feb]	36
* //Farooq's Formula Decried as Useless [AJ 15 Feb]	37
* Amnesty Allowed Into Kashmir, Russian Support Claimed [NAVBHARAT TIMES 15 Feb]	37
* Return to Normalcy Urged in Kashmir [JANSATTA 16 Feb]	38
* Commentary Notes 'Pakistani Complicity' in Kashmir [Delhi Radio]	39
* Aggressive Posture Against Militants Favored [INDIAN EXPRESS 17 Feb]	39
* Warning Issued on Attempts to Internationalize Kashmir [AJ 18 Feb]	41
* BJP President Denounces U.S. 'Interference' Over Kashmir [INDIAN EXPRESS 18 Feb]	41
* Security Forces Fault Government Planning in Kashmir [THE WEEK 20 Feb]	41
* Kashmir Problem Viewed More Intractable Than Punjab [THE WEEK 20 Feb]	42
* Difficulties in Kashmir Seen Spiraling [THE WEEK 20 Feb]	44
* U.S. Said Supporting Pakistan Kashmir Position For Own Interests [BARTAMAN 20 Feb 94]	47
* Advani Says Kashmir 'Non-Negotiable' [THE TIMES OF INDIA 20 Feb]	48
* Rao Summit With Clinton Urged To Overcome Misunderstanding [THE TELEGRAPH 20 Feb]	49
* ICO Reproved for Pro-Pakistani 'Political Intrigues' [INDIAN EXPRESS 21 Feb]	50
* Editorial on Kashmir 'Big Game,' U.S. Role [ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA 21 Feb]	51
* Advani Calls for Restoration of Normalcy to Valley [AJ 21 Feb]	51
* Commentary Criticizes U.S. Stand on Kashmir [AJ 21 Feb]	51
* Openness Urged in Diplomatic War Over Kashmir [PUNJAB KESARI 22 Feb]	52
* Nation Said United Against U.S. Kashmir Policy [THE TELEGRAPH 22 Feb]	54
* Article says U.S. 'Soft' on Pakistan View of Kashmir [INDIAN EXPRESS 23 Feb]	55

* Commentary Applauds Parliament's 'Warning' to Pakistan [Delhi Radio]	56
BJP Supports Government Resolution on Kashmir [THE TELEGRAPH 23 Feb]	56
* Paper Applauds Parliament's Affirmation on Kashmir [INDIAN EXPRESS 24 Feb]	57
* Panun Kashmir Highlights Government Neglect of Hindus [INDIAN EXPRESS 25 Feb]	57
* Government Seen Downplaying Spread of Violence To Jammu [JANSATTA 25 Feb]	58
* Hindu Voice Raised, Justice Sought [NAV BHARAT TIMES 25 Feb]	58
* Panun Kashmiri Pandits Say Government Vacillating [NAV BHARAT TIMES 25 Feb]	59
* Islamic World Said Divided Over Kashmir Response [NAV BHARAT TIMES 25 Feb]	59
* London Said Becoming Center of Kashmiri Separatism [THE TIMES OF INDIA 25 Feb]	60
* U.S. Diplomacy Over Kashmir Seen Irresponsible [THE TELEGRAPH 28 Feb]	61
* Foreign Assistance Said Unneeded in Solving Kashmir Crisis [AJ 1 Mar]	61
* Pakistan Strategy on Kashmir Said Well-Planned [THE TELEGRAPH 3 Mar]	62
* Kashmiri Refugees Claim Government Ignorant of Plight [THE STATESMAN 3 Mar]	64
* Editorial Questions U.S. Intentions in Kashmir [THE HINDUSTAN TIMES 4 Mar]	65
* Commentary Views Foreign Mercenary Threat in Kashmir [Delhi Radio]	65
* Article Questions How Long Government Will Disregard Pandits [JANSATTA 5 Mar]	66
* Official Calls Withdrawal of Pakistan Resolution Unconditional [Delhi Radio]	67
* Official Statement, Opposition Response to Kashmir Resolution [Delhi Radio]	67
* Minister Says Kashmir Open to Foreign Journalists [Delhi Radio]	68

PAKISTANI VIEWS

* Talks With India Over Kashmir Examined [AKHBAR-E-JEHAN 16 Jan]	69
* Kashmir Said Destined To Be Pakistani [JASARAT 26 Jan]	70
* Editorial Urges UN, Western Action on Kashmir [JANG 28 Jan]	70
* Editorial Notes, Welcomes Change in Russia's Kashmir Stand [JANG 1 Feb]	71
* Paper Criticizes Amanullah Khan's Ideology on Kashmir [NAWA-I-WAQT 1 Feb]	71
* Kashmiris Said Waiting for Muslim Conqueror [JASARAT 1 Feb]	71
* International Community's 'Silence' Over Kashmir Attacked [JASARAT 3 Feb]	72
* Bhutto's Kashmir Policy Examined [MASHRIQ 8 Feb]	72
* Kashmir Liberation Force Established [AMN 8 Feb]	73
* U.S. Attitude Towards Kashmir Problem Examined [JANG 9 Feb]	73
* Indian Attitude Towards Kashmir Said Leading to War [JANG 9 Feb]	74
* PML(N) Senator Denounces Bhutto's Kashmir Policy [TAKBEER 10 Feb]	76
* Efforts to 'Liberate' Kashmir Reviewed [JASARAT 10 Feb]	78
* U.S. Said Given Green Light For Military Bases in Kashmir [JASARAT 12 Feb]	80
* Kashmiri Militant Groups Reviewed [JANG 13 Feb]	80
* Beg Sees U.S. Push for Independent Kashmir [THE FRONTIER POST 14 Feb]	82
* Diplomatic Moves on Kashmir Seen Successful [JANG 19 Feb]	82
* Commentary Urges India to Face, Resolve Kashmir Crisis [Islamabad Radio]	83
* Editorial Urges Change in Indian Attitude for Peace [NAWA-I-WAQT 25 Feb]	84
* Bhutto Warns of Islamic World 'Sentiment' Over Kashmir [London AL-HAYAH 25 Feb]	84
* Foreign Minister Lauds Results of UN Kashmir Vote [THE MUSLIM 10 Mar]	84
* Kashmir Leader Demands Inquiry Into Arms Seizure [NAWA-I-WAQT 10 Mar]	85
* Radio Reports Reaction to Kashmir Geneva Vote 'Deferment' [Islamabad Radio]	85
* Opposition Calls UN Kashmir Vote Withdrawal 'Fiasco' [THE MUSLIM 11 Mar]	86
* Bhutto Comments on Kashmir Human Rights Resolution [Islamabad Radio]	86

*** Kashmiri Hindus Urge Return of Multi-Ethnic Society**

94AS0190C Madras *INDIAN EXPRESS* in English
10 Jan 94 p 13

[Quotation marks as published]

[Text] The World Kashmiri Pandit conference in Delhi was understandably an occasion for much pent-up emotion to be expressed. It is to be expected that a small community living in exile with little hope of returning soon to its home should be overwhelmed in equal measure by anger and sorrow. The squalor and humiliation of life in ramshackled refugee camps, the break-up of families, the loss of jobs and property and the abiding fear about the disappearance of their culture must all evoke widespread sympathy for the Kashmiri Pandits. What is remarkable about the gathering is that in the midst of so many depressing circumstances the true spirit of 'Kashmiryat' survives. Many delegates were able to rise above their pain and anguish to urge the restoration of communal harmony and a multi-ethnic, multi-religious society in Kashmir.

Let there be no mistake about it. It takes exceptional courage and wisdom on the part of those who have suffered most since the ascendancy of militancy in Kashmir to cling to such a vision of the future. There were those, of course, who demanded a separate homeland where Kashmiri Pandits could feel secure. No one will want to blame them for this after what they have been through. The sense of betrayal they experienced as a result of the Central government's bungling on Kashmir over the years is also a major impetus for the feeling of separateness that has spread through the community. It must be hoped that in time and with the redressal of many of their grievances in exile and an improvement in the situation within Kashmir, all Kashmiris will learn to put their faith once again in a multi-cultural state. Some may, for political reasons, pander to the feeling of Kashmiri Pandit separateness but such counsel should be rejected as dangerous and self-defeating. As is evident from many parts of the world where ethnic conflict rages, the effort to create separate entities out of communities which have intermingled for centuries ends in terrible tragedy and the most inhuman suffering for all.

Initiatives like the World Kashmiri Pandit conference are important. Not only do they provide a forum to bring scattered Pandits together to air their problems and anxieties, but they are necessary to draw national and international attention to the plight of the exiles. Little is known, for example, about how much Pandit women have suffered in the last few years. There is much work to be done on the world stage. One can think of no better mechanism than a standing committee of World Kashmiri Pandits to inform the outside world about conditions in Kashmir under rampant militancy aided by

Pakistan. A more important role would be in broadcasting to a largely ignorant western world the Kashmiri Pandit version of Kashmir as a harmonious, multi-ethnic society which Hindus, Muslims, Buddhists, Gujjars and many other communities can call their home.

*** Paper Ponders Change in Pakistan Attitude Toward Talks**

BK2601042894 Delhi *INDIAN EXPRESS* in English
20 Jan 94 p 8

[Editorial: "Pakistani Inflexibility"]

[Text] Why has Islamabad suddenly set its face against continuation of the Indo-Pakistan dialogue initiated by the Foreign Secretaries just two weeks ago? Two causes are indicated. The first is the compulsions of domestic politics. This factor has, of course, always had a decisive influence on the Pakistani stand on bilateral talks. But the latest brusque refusal to pick up the thread of the discussions between J.N. Dixit and Shahryar Khan, is a particularly striking instance. J.N. Dixit and Shahryar Khan had themselves envisaged a resumption of the dialogue soon enough. This was the implication of the clear Indian offer to submit detailed proposals in search of common ground on Siachen and Sir Creek. This apart, Benazir Bhutto herself had given ample cause for the belief she was interested in an understanding on Siachen. Since then the climate in Pakistan has been anything but favourable for serious talks with India.

Nawaz Sharif has stepped up efforts to portray the PM [prime minister] as one who is inclined to do a deal with India on Kashmir. The Pakistani decision not to go ahead with a resolution in the UN General Assembly seeking to censure India for alleged human rights violations has especially drawn much flak in the Pakistani media as well as in the National Assembly. Other domestic difficulties, too, have somewhat weakened her position. Not the least of them has been her quarrels with her mother and brother both of whom seem to be determined to embarrass her in every possible way. If the upshot of all this has been to persuade her not to accord relations with India a high priority, it is a logical sequel.

Conceivably, the rigid tone of the Pakistan Foreign Office's statement ruling out a continuation of the bilateral dialogue—reflected in the call to "finalise modalities" for a plebiscite in Kashmir—may also mean a felt need for a review of all that has been done to hasten annexation of Kashmir. Pending the outcome of any such exercise, it is a common practice for Foreign Offices to reiterate fundamental positions on contentious issues with an air of finality. In purely rational terms, a thorough review should be a natural corollary to the failure of the frenetic campaign carried on by Pakistan abroad to compel India to concede Kashmir. In the last five years, Islamabad has left no stone unturned to convince the rest of the world that India is committing a genocide in Kashmir and that the only way of putting an end to it is for India to hand over the territory to

Pakistan. But this has hardly had the desired impact. What then should be done? The policy-makers in Islamabad cannot possibly avoid asking themselves this question any longer. Further, Islamabad's tussle with pro-independence Kashmiri groups in Pakistan has intensified. All this adds up to a major challenge to both the security and foreign policy establishments in Islamabad. How they will cope with it is hard even to guess.

*** Kashmir Said Only Homeland of Pandits**

94AS0212A New Delhi ORGANISER in English
23 Jan 94 pp 17-18

[Article by M.V. Kamath: "The Fate of Kashmiri Pandits"]

[Text] An international conference of Kashmiri Pandits was held in Delhi in the last week of December 1993 to focus the attention firstly of all Indians and secondly of the world beyond, on their present fate. And what is their fate? Their fate is to live as refugees in places outside the Vale of Kashmir which has been their ancestral home for centuries, in make-shift tents, braving the cold in winter and the searing heat in summer with no proper sanitary facilities and less medical attention. Organisations like Asia Watch while raising howls about the difficulties of Kashmiri Muslims, make no more than passing reference to the inhuman brutalities with which the Muslim terrorists have dealt with them. Over three lakh Kashmiri Pandits have been forced to flee their homes under threat of death. The terrorists have indulged in the rape of women and the killing of men in the best style of invading Muslim hordes of the Middle Ages. The latest incident is the shooting down of a hundred-year old Kashmiri Pandit in Wanpora in the first week of June 1993. In what way an aged man could have menaced Islam only the terrorists can tell. The Kashmir Government is silent on this as on other reckless murders. The Government of India is embarrassingly silent. Nobody wants to speak out lest their secular credentials are questioned by anyone. In 1941, according to census figures, Muslims formed 83 percent of the population of the Vale of Kashmir and Hindus 15 percent. In 1991 Muslims formed 97 percent of the population and Hindus 0.1 percent. Ethnic cleansing is complete. Aurangzeb would have been proud of the Muslim terrorists for the splendid work the latter have accomplished in the last four decades. According to a booklet published by the Kashmiri Samiti on human rights violation in Kashmir, the terrorist killings have been accompanied by torture unheard of in the annals of human history and includes strangulation by using steel wires, hanging, impaling, branding with red hot irons, burning alive, lynching, gouging of eyes before assassination, dismemberment of body, dragging to death and just plain slaughter. The booklet gives details including the names of those killed and the dates they were killed. The Government of India is free to challenge these facts and if they are untrue, this should be publicised. If they are true, we need an explanation. According to the booklet "the (Kashmiri) State Government is yet to disclose the

identity of about 400 dead bodies recovered by the police and disposed of at its will". The booklet accuses the State Government of an attempt "to cover the anti-Hindu character of the terrorist violence and has tried to play down the massacre of Hindus". It is true that the terrorists have also killed Muslims not in their good books. Total civilians so far killed number 2,256 in five years (1988-1992) for which figures are available. The majority, of course, are Hindus—Kashmiri Pandits. The unpleasant fact about Kashmir and its terrorist faction is that the crusade is to merge the State with Pakistan and drive every single Hindu out. Already the ethnic cleansing is almost complete. The brunt of hatred has been borne by the Kashmiri Pandits who have been denied elementary human rights. But to this date the fate of the Kashmiri Pandits is of no concern to anybody.

But let it be said clearly and precisely: Kashmir belongs to the Kashmiri Pandits, the original inhabitants of the state—and NOT to the Muslims, just as Kuwait, or Oman or Bahrain which have non-Muslim majorities belong to the local Muslims because the latter are the original inhabitants of the areas. Islam came to India only in the 12th century. That a good number of the original Hindus were forcibly converted to Islam does not hide the fact that the background and the past of all Kashmiris is Hindu and should be recognised as such. The list of distinguished Kashmiri poets and scholars in Sanskrit from the Vedic period right on to the 12th century is long and impressive. The list tapers off following the advent of Islam in the Vale.

To say that Kashmir is Muslim is a negation of history and a pandering to the whims of the neo-historians. Kashmir was, is and shall remain essentially Hindu and cannot be permitted to go into the hands of Pakistan for the last traces of Hinduism to be wiped out for ever. That is why the Kashmiris have been asking for a "homeland" of their own. That homeland can only be in Kashmir, not in Dandakaranya or somewhere in the wilds of Madhya Pradesh. And there is nothing fanciful in the demand of the Pandits. If Jews in their diaspora could dream and fight for a Jewish state two thousand years after they were dispersed in the four corners of Europe and get the support of modern states like Britain, France and United States and other smaller nations, there is no reason why the Kashmiri Pandits should not ask for a homeland here and now, while their status as refugees is temporary. There is an attempt made by our "intellectuals" to fob off the Kashmiri Pandits with false promises by saying that, why, of course, they could get back to their homes they were forced to vacate when the Kashmir issue is "settled". Nobody asks the question: Settled how? Or when? Or under what conditions? They are not consulted when the foreign secretaries of India and Pakistan discuss the so-called "Kashmir Question" as if their fate is of no moment. Aren't they entitled to know? Are they destined for ever to live as refugees at the mercy as much of a callous government as of a callous class of "intellectuals"?

There can be—and there should be—no Kashmir “settlement” without the guaranteed return of the Kashmiri Pandits to their ancestral homes. And even that is not enough. The State should guarantee that they will not be treated as second class citizens as has been the case these last four decades. They cannot be left to the tender mercies of ex-terrorists and their ilk. One can be sure that if Pakistan has its way, there will be no place for Kashmiri Pandits in Kashmir, which is their legitimate home. Under no circumstances should this be allowed to come to pass. Islamic terrorists should not be allowed to get away with murder. To support Kashmiri Pandits in their just cause—which is a demand for a homeland—is not *communalism*. Conceding that Kashmir is “Muslim” is *reverse communalism*. Kashmiri Pandits have a sound case and it should be presented in every international forum. The Government has to stop being defeatist. Kashmir cannot be given away to Pakistan; nor can it be handed over on a platter to Islamic fundamentalists. The safe return of the Kashmiri Pandits to their ancestral homes is—and should be—the special responsibility of the Government of India which cannot be dodged or made slight of. Kashmir is the homeland of the Pandits—and so it will remain.

*** U.S. Growing Interest in Kashmir Questioned**
94AS0187C Varanasi AJ in Hindi 24 Jan 94 p 6

[Article by Amitabh Kautilya: “America’s Interest in Playing the Kashmir Game is Increasing”]

[Text] Pigeon raising and kite flying are hobbies like running for elections, as are addictions to heroin, charas, and hashish. Countries, just like humans, have their weaknesses. For example, playing with Kashmir is becoming a new addiction for the United States. Only politicians know the political reasons for it. Our knowledge about it is very different. Professor Ronald C. Kessler, chairman of sociology department at Michigan University, has written in the latest issue of the *Archives of General Psychiatry*, that he is not afraid or hesitant in admitting that about half the U.S. population is suffering from one or another form of mental sickness.

It is important to note that a female official Raphael in the U.S. State Department who had visited India last year had went as far as to say that the documents about Kashmir’s joining India are dubious in nature. If someone talks like this, we cannot call her anything but insane. There have been elections in Kashmir several times and the Kashmiri people had taken part in them.

Now another U.S. official has insisted that a plebiscite must be held in Kashmir. Earlier, another gentleman had said that representatives of Kashmiri people should be included in talks between India and Pakistan. Pakistan has been demanding a plebiscite in Kashmir for a long time. Its voice was subdued as long as we kept holding elections. However, when it managed to make half the Kashmiris flee the land though its terrorist activities, it has increased its demand for a plebiscite considering it

an appropriate time for it. This time, the United States is not only becoming an unwanted guest while agreeing with Pakistan, it is establishing itself where it does not belong.

China also became very alert when it saw the increasing romance between Pakistan and United States over Kashmir. Similarly, the way Janata Dal legislators are becoming disillusioned with Imam Buhkhari, China’s romance with Pakistan is also breaking off. China has made it clear that no other party should be involved in the Pakistan-India talks.

It seems that the Indian Government has concluded the same thing as my own Sheikh Chilly [dunce] brand intelligence has determined. The Indian Government has contracted an American specialist firm to counter the Kashmiri and Khalistani propaganda in the United States. This professional organization has been contracted only for six months beginning from 15 January.

Evidently the Indian Government had to take this step when it had no alternatives left. The Pakistani embassy already has been using this strategy. This firm is not only presenting Pakistani claims to the U.S. Senators and those who form public opinion, but is also spreading this deplorable propaganda that India is violating human rights in Kashmir. It was just such a firm that had pulled the miracle of making Indian rugs untouchable things in U.S. and European markets under the pretext of human rights violations and abuse of child labor.

It happens in mental sickness, that a deranged person understands only what is told to him. A crazy person will believe that he is an owl or the president. This is because either he lacks the brain cells that can distinguish fact from fiction or these are as weak as the BSP-SP [Bahujan Samaj Party-Samajwadi Party] coalition in Uttar Pradesh.

This survey has brought to light the fact that half of the U.S. population is crazy, therefore, we should not be surprised if half of its population believes that Kashmir is a part of Pakistan and India has illegally occupied that region just like Iraq had occupied Kuwait.

I was getting depressed thinking about it all, especially because according to the agreement signed recently, the Russian cannons will be aimed at other targets than the United States of America. In this time of crisis, if there is a ray of hope then it comes from China which has become very alert to the U.S. attitude. May God keep it on the alert. Someone was perfectly right when he said that a drowning man reaches for straws to save himself. China is on the alert also because if the United States gets to China in this monkey distribution system, China may lose a lot.

The other reason for worry is that the 1.2 million talented and rich Indians who live or study in the United States might import to India mental sickness in addition to AIDS. We have one example of it. Despite this large population of Indian people living in the United States,

India had to hire a private firm to counter the Pakistani propaganda. It is possible that patriotism and love for India disappears just like moustaches once one lands in the United States.

The game played in Kuwait increased the U.S. prestige and inspired fear in Asia. It appears that the United States wants to play the game of Kashmir because of it. It is important to mention here that some habits are so strong that they go with one's funeral. The Kashmir game might take the United States in that direction. We think that far ahead because a soothsayer said 400 years ago that there will be a divine incarnation in 1999 that will establish India's dominance all over the world. India is moving toward that moment very fast.

Just like this huge country does not have even one athlete who could win even one gold medal in the Olympics, we do not have even one Goebbels with a powerful brain to have the ability to prove truth as lie and lie as truth. If we had such a brilliant person born here, the Indian Government would not have to knock at the doors of a private firm. There still is no idea how we will benefit from it. It is possible that this firm might have contracts with Pakistan and the so-called Khalistanis to get popular support for them. Lawyers have the ethical requirement that they cannot represent the defendant and the plaintiff at the same time. A business organization does not have such restrictions. The same firm can print posters for the Samajwadi Party and the BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party]. One publicity firm can make a publicity film for the Congress (I) and the National Front!

If the U.S. craze continued then it is possible for it to have the opportunity to impact on Kashmir. What can we say about our government as we do not know in which world it is. It is still following the Article of the Indian Constitution which allows separate laws for Kashmir. This Article is causing a major problem. We cannot send new people to work in the positions vacated by the patriots who are fleeing Kashmir. Would not Kashmir be replete with patriotic brave people if we did not have this law?

The Indian Government spokesmen repeatedly say that Kashmir is India's integral part, however, India does not have the courage to remove the discrepancies within the Constitution. Had it that much courage, we believe then the United States would not have been so eager to play the Kashmir game, and Pakistan had to worry about creating a new strategy and setting off a new squib to the world. If Pakistan is eager for a nuclear war then it will have it. One benefit of it will be that when the new century arrives, there will be no Pakistan left and all the neighbors will be enjoying peace. We have to make as much sacrifice for peace and goodwill in the next century as we did by living in hapless conditions for the last 45 years in the name of progress.

* U.S. Stance on Kashmir Seen Hostile

94AS0187D New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 25 Jan 94
p 4

[Editorial: "The American Grip"]

[Text] A fortnight after his mischievous letter about Punjab, President Clinton has written a mischievous letter about Kashmir now. He has written the last letter to Ghulam Nabi Fai, the president of the Kashmiri American Council who supports terrorists in Kashmir. This letter is addressed to Gary Condit in response to a letter written by 15 U.S. lawmakers. In this letter he had agreed with the concern expressed by these legislators about Punjab and had supported a resolution of the Punjab problem in which the human rights of the Sikhs are protected. When the letter from Clinton to Ghulam Nabi Fai was shared, the U.S. administration had tried to clarify that there has been no change in the U.S. stand and it was not necessary to dwell too much on the letter written to Ghulam Nabi Fai. It was said that this letter was just a formality and not a specifically written letter. However, the recent letter about Punjab does not leave any room for reassurance about Bill Clinton's designs.

Thus, the Indian Government had no alternative but to take these negative signs coming from the United States of America seriously. It is imperative that it mobilize its ambassador in the United States to object to the U.S. stand and state that such actions will adversely effect U.S.-India relations. However, doing this will not be enough. This is not the first time that Bill Clinton and his government have shown such an aggressive attitude toward India. We have already seen U.S. actions such as laws relating to intellectual property and the NPT [Non-proliferation Treaty]. This U.S. policy is pushing India toward the wall using the so-called human rights issue which the United States is using in the context of Kashmir and Punjab.

The fear that a democratic president, once elected, would increase pressure on India was expressed in the circles that sympathize with India before the presidential elections in the United States. This fear was based on the fact that democratic presidents are very active on human rights and the NPT, and the anti-India lobbies have been very active over these two issues for some time. At the same time, it is believed that the United States will impose its economic policies very aggressively in order to fight the economic recession at home. In this context, it will exert a lot of pressure over the laws relating to intellectual property. Keeping in mind these old fears, the anti-India attitude of the U.S. President and his administration was not taken seriously.

However, the attitude of Bill Clinton and his administration cannot be ignored as the expected attitude of a Democrat President. Another reason is that the United States is now ignoring all the Pakistani activities to encourage terrorists in India. Second, Bill Clinton's attitude about Kashmir and Punjab is also directly

encouraging the terrorists in Kashmir and Punjab. Obviously, Bill Clinton cannot be unaware of the results of his actions. We have to conclude that the United States is deliberately increasing pressure on India and trying to weaken it. In this situation, India cannot be satisfied just by registering its objection at diplomatic level. It must see and understand how it can counter this anti-Indian attitude of the United States.

*** Daily Defends Delhi's Kashmir Proposals to Pakistan**

BK0202131894 Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES
in Hindi 26 Jan 94 p 4

[Editorial: "Pakistan's Kashmir Hysteria"]

[Text] It is not only unfortunate, but mischievous as well, that, while India has sent six proposals to improve relations with Pakistan, there is some sort of a race taking place in Pakistan to keep the anti-India campaign at a feverish pitch. In an address to the nation, Prime Minister Bhutto said the day is not far off when Kashmir will be a part of Pakistan. She said her government would ask the Geneva-based Human Rights Commission to expose Indian repression in Kashmir. Whatever gestures one makes, Pakistan does not want to cool off the anti-Indian tirade. With the same objective in mind, a call has been made to observe a general strike in Pakistan on 5 February on the Kashmir issue.

The Pakistani Government last week sent two nonofficial proposals on holding a plebiscite in Kashmir that were rejected by India because it said only the Shimla Agreement could be the basis for talks. On the other hand, Pakistan believes that unless the so-called repression in Kashmir is not stopped, jailed Kashmiris are not freed, and the siege of Hazratbal Shrine in Srinagar not ended, there could be no meaningful dialogue with India. Obviously, Pakistan does not desire negotiations at all. It is only putting forth excuses. Pakistan should realize that eventually all issues are settled through talks and not by guns. If Pakistan still does not desire to enter into a dialogue, it will mean that it is not serious and wants to vitiate the atmosphere before the start of any negotiations.

The six proposals sent by India are definitely significant in the context of the normalization of relations. India has proposed to maintain peace at the Line of Control in Kashmir—like the one agreed upon with China, although both sides will not give up their claims. This means that as an interim measure it will be accepted that for the time being that the Pakistan-ruled part of Kashmir will remain with it and the Indian-ruled Kashmir with us, while mutual talks will continue on the border claims. If Pakistan does not accept such a revolutionary proposal, it will be clear that its intentions are not honest. After all, how would Pakistan be threatened if it agrees to the proposal that no country make the first use of its nuclear capability against one another? The above two proposals are aimed at creating mutual trust.

The demilitarization of Siachen Glacier, the delineation of Sir Creek maritime boundary near Kutch, and the settlement of the Tulbul barrage issue are all proposals made by India in good faith. Revitalizing the Joint Working Commission is also a need of the hour. If Pakistan agrees to hold talks on all these proposals, a favorable atmosphere will be created for a dialogue on Kashmir as well. Pakistan will achieve nothing by putting the Kashmir gun on India's temple. India is fully capable of defending its borders. Pakistan is intimidating the world by shouting Kashmir, Kashmir, and by doing so it is also gaining sympathy. We should strive to counter Pakistan's Kashmir diplomacy. Dialogue should go on, Pakistan should be brought to its senses and war readiness should be ensured, that is the only alternative left for India. However, the best scenario will be if good sense prevails upon Pakistan and it comes to the talks with a realistic approach.

*** Changes in U.S. Policy Towards Kashmir Seen Worrisome**

94AS0187E New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 27 Jan 94
p 4

[Article by Raj Mohan Vajpayee: "No Solution to the Kashmir Problem Will Be Had From Headsupmanship"]

[Text] There has been a major change in the U.S. attitude. During the cold war it used its destructive military might as a medium for political victories, however, this policy was not successful. Vietnam is a prominent example of this failure. The U.S. viewpoint changed after the fall of the Soviet Union. It is implementing a policy of having various parties hold talks in order to maintain its dominance. Examples of these efforts are the Arab-Israeli talks and talks among the Serb, Croat, and Muslim communities in Bosnia.

The United States may have its own interests in holding these talks. We would be ignoring facts if we believe that this police work being done by the United States to establish law and order at international level is an unselfish deed. Have these policies succeeded in establishing peace in the nations involved? Has the fighting and the mutual destruction changed? We can surmise the answer to these questions by reviewing the present world situation.

The statements issued by President Clinton and his administration over India-Pakistan relations have created a controversial situation. If we look at former President Bush's term, we will find that there is a major difference between the two. It would be wrong to believe that the role of bilateral talks in the U.S. policy, especially in foreign policy or international relations, is not important. It has helped various nations depending on their interests and their having cooperated—be it Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Israel, or Pakistan. The fact that it did not help them because of altruistic reasons is a different issue.

The Jammu-Kashmir question has an important place in India-Pakistan relations. It would be ignoring facts if we think that the bitterness between India and Pakistan will end if the Jammu-Kashmir issue is resolved. There are many chasms between the two countries, and it would not be appropriate to say that if one chasm is filled up the other chasms will not cause problems.

If we say that the United States is very worried over Kashmir, then it must be shedding crocodile tears or it is the change in its foreign policy affected after the fall of the Soviet Union. Why did not the U.S. attitude change when Pakistan gave away Aksai Chin region to its then-declared enemy China? The United States continued to be Pakistan's supporter and adopted a harsh attitude toward India.

There is no doubt that Pakistan used aggressive lobbying to keep its position strong in the United States, and India has been laggard in this area. India has recently been expressing its reactions to various developments. It is clear from India's spending about 8 billion rupees for lobbying that our policy is very myopic and ineffective. The results are in front of us; the United States is not influenced by the Indian side.

A while ago, Assistant Secretary Robin Raphel declared the 1947 merger of Jammu-Kashmir with India to be totally disputable. Earlier, the almost-appointed ambassador to India, Solarz, had also disappointed the Indian government with his statements. It is not true that Siddhartha Shankar Ray, the present Indian ambassador to the United States, has been successful in presenting the Indian side effectively to the United States. Therefore, the wrong impressions that the United States has about India will remain for some time.

We cannot deny that after the Robin Raphel statement, there has existed an anti-United States attitude among all Indian opposition parties, intellectuals, and the media. The United States did not express any reaction to Raphel's statements in the beginning. However, seeing the increasing Indian reaction, spokesmen and officials in the Clinton administration issued statements declaring the Jammu-Kashmir related announcements to be personal opinions, that there has been no change in the U.S. policy on India and expressed happiness at the India-Pakistan talks at the secretary level.

The words of Woodrow Wilson Center's Mitchell Reese about India-Pakistan relations seem to be very realistic. According to him, the Kashmir issue cannot be used to hinder resolution of other problems. He believes that resolution of various minor problems will create an atmosphere conducive of resolving larger issues. Before the 2 January talks at foreign secretary level, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto had said that India-Pakistan relations will not improve until the Kashmir issue is taken care of. The foreign minister of Pakistan also announced in Parliament that Jammu-Kashmir would become a part of Pakistan within the next five years because India would have fallen by then. We can call

these statements efforts by Pakistani rulers to impress the Pakistani people or to shut up the opposition. However, why is the United States ignoring such statements by one side when efforts are being made to improve India-Pakistan relations? Does the United States think that Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto has the right to declare in the United States that Pakistan will never suspend its nuclear program? Pakistan will continue to expand its program despite all the pressure, and pressure will be put on India to sign the NPT. Clinton is talking about removing the various restrictions imposed on Pakistan. What can we infer from such American thinking?

There is no doubt that Pakistan, Kashmiri militant organizations, and their supporters have retained the services of such companies as Black, Manafort, Stone and Kelly for powerful and effective lobbying. This not only spreads their ideas and statements, but also influences important people. It is believed that an organization of non-resident Kashmiris, the Kashmiri-American Council, that supports a plebiscite in Kashmir, has hired the expensive lobbying firm of Stone and Kelly. One major result of this effort is President Clinton's ten-line long letter to Ghulam Nabi Fai, the executive director of the Kashmiri-American Council. We find that the Washington-based organization Kashmiri-American Council is strongly opposed to Maharajah Hari Singh's merger of Jammu-Kashmir with India. This organization has challenged Jammu-Kashmir's merger with India from the very beginning. There is no doubt that this organization receives all kind of support from Pakistan, other Islamic nations that agree with it, and various so-called human rights organizations.

President Clinton told Ghulam Nabi Fai in his letter that he would like to work with people like him to establish peace in Kashmir. He expressed his agreement with Fai and wrote that the human rights aspect should have a strong place in his policies in the changed world situation after the Cold War. It is possible that Clinton's letter was just expressing hope for the future. However, Ghulam Nabi Fai, the Kashmiri-American Council, and its members will not only propagate it as U.S. agreeing with them, but also prove a major headache for India by amplifying the effect of this letter. If we look at the events prior to this letter, it should be clear that Assistant Secretary Robin Raphel's opinion about Kashmir and the feelings hidden in President Clinton's letter complement each other. A third party has been added to the Kashmir problem.

If we look at the Jammu-Kashmir issue and India-Pakistan relations, we will learn that White House residents before Clinton had repeatedly said that India and Pakistan should resolve this issue according to the Shimla agreement of 1972. There is no mention of a third party in the Shimla agreement. The UN resolutions call for the people of Jammu, Kashmir, and Laddakh to decide whether they want to stay in India or Pakistan. The question arises whether the present situation is appropriate for holding a plebiscite. Is there a specific

deadline for such an atmosphere? What will the situation be like in Jammu-Kashmir when an appropriate situation is created?

If we look at the U.S. President's opinions as these appear, it seems that there have been major changes in the foreign policy and the thinking of the influential people in the administration after the end of the cold war. From the Indian perspective, especially within the framework of India-Pakistan relations, this change does not agree with the Indian view point. The United States, despite its open denial, does want to establish its supremacy here. It seems that the events related to Bosnia, Somalia, and Haiti have not taught a lesson to the U.S. policy-makers. The strong U.S. desire to dominate the talks in Jammu-Kashmir will not resolve this issue because both India and Pakistan do not want the Kashmiri people to make a decision against them. In addition, even when we grant that India and Pakistan may change their Kashmir-related policy under international pressure, will it help a move toward permanent peace?

*** Editorial Criticizes U.S. Reaction to Kashmir Issue**

BK0402141094 Calcutta ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA in Bengali 28 Jan 94 p 4

[Editorial: "Letter Writer to American President"]

[Text] A cartoon has been published in newspapers showing U.S. President Bill Clinton busy writing letters by dipping his pen in a pot containing poison instead of ink. Meanwhile, official circles in the United States have expressed surprise over the hue and cry in India centering around the two letters written by President Clinton. They even questioned why the Indian Government felt it necessary to lodge protests over the letters. Washington stated that the President's office receives many letters every day, and his staff prepares the reply to the letters selected by them. It added that the President only puts his signature on letters drafted by his staff. The President does not have the time to go through these letters to see what has been written. Their clarification is not totally untrue. If the President had to reply to all the letters received by his office, then perhaps he would not have time to do other tasks, including eating and bathing. However, the explanation given by the President's aides is not acceptable. It is surprising to note that letters written on political issues are taken so lightly by the President's office, and replies to such letters are also prepared in the same manner. It is desirable that the President's signature carry more weight.

The President should decide which letters should be selected for replies. He cannot refuse to give a reply to the letter written by Congressman Gary A. Condit who belongs to his own party. Someone should have the responsibility of going through the subject matter of the letter and taking precautions in replying so that it does not hurt those who are concerned with it. It is possible

that the close aides of the President can work in accordance with their own likings and dislikings and justify their actions in the name of the President. Congressman Condit might feel encouraged to plead shamelessly for the militants of Khalistan with a view to pleasing a section of the voters in his constituency. However, the tone of the President's letter shows that he is himself pleading for the Sikhs. In replying to another letter sent by the pro-Pakistan Kashmiri American Council, President Clinton's letter gives the impression that he is raising the issue of protecting human rights in Kashmir with a view to assisting the secessionists. The U.S. Government spokesman has said that such an interpretation of the President's letter is unfortunate. He further added that Washington does not support terrorists or secessionist activities in any part of the globe. Their claim may not be wrong, but it does not seem that staff of the White House have the professional skill to prove their claim in the case of India.

It should be noted that the Indian Government did not hesitate to lodge a strong protest in this regard. New Delhi also expressed its dissatisfaction over the issue through its ambassador in Washington, Siddharta Shankar Ray. It is necessary to lodge protests against the tendency of the present U.S. administration to indulge in unnecessary bossing. However, it would not be proper to think that the responsibility of India is over after the lodging of the protest. It is a type of weakness to display reaction over all matters. On one hand, we claim that human rights are not being violated in Punjab, Kashmir, or any other part of the country, while on the other, we will express our anger if anyone wants to probe into the alleged violations. This is not fair. In the past, several attempts were made to tarnish the image of our armed forces by bringing false charges against them. This is not acceptable. It is necessary to follow an open-door policy with a view to protecting the image of our armed forces. This would help in removing the doubts and the concern being expressed over human rights violations. It is true that the army and the police sometimes resort to repression, but the number of such incidents is very small. For this reason, it is good to confess the truth. This is the best way to close the mouths of those who protest. We should give up the habit of concealing to make others think that we have nothing to conceal.

*** U.S. Blamed for Aggravating Misunderstanding With Pakistan**

BK0402162694 Delhi PATRIOT in English 28 Jan 94 p 4

[Editorial: "Bhutto: 'Not Enough'"]

[Text] Six proposals, reports say, have been sent by India to Pakistan in a serious attempt to have normal relations with its neighbour. The package offered once again reflects India's desire to resolve all bilateral issues with Pakistan amicably. Outstanding issues have evaded a solution mainly because of the rigid postures adopted by

Islamabad. U.S. President Bill Clinton's recent pronouncements have encouraged such an inflexible posture taken by the government of Ms. Benazir Bhutto. Pakistan, it would appear, has embarked on a revanchist policy. Whether it is army rule or an elected regime, India-baiting is the favoured game of politicians and generals. They have used it to ascend to power. The U.S., seeking a sway over South Asia, is another factor that continues to bedevil relationships in this subcontinent. The present unipolar regime has created serious difficulties for countries like India which believe in peaceful and harmonious co-existence. But Pakistan is a country of this region: It cannot change the geography of its location. India rightly expects Pakistan to appreciate and reciprocate the sincerity with which the six proposals have been offered to defuse tensions. Broadly, the proposals relate to disengagement of the embattled forces in the Siachen area; demarcation of the boundary in the Sir Creek area in the Runn of Kutch; the marine boundary in the same area; talks on Tulbul navigation project; additional confidence building measures relating to nuclear energy installations; restructuring the working of the sub-commissions under the Indo-Pak Joint Commission; and ensuring peace and tranquility along the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir. These proposals were handed over to Pakistan's High Commissioner Riaz Khokhar by foreign secretary J.N. Dixit as promised by him at the last round of talks with Pakistan foreign secretary Shaharyar Khan. Most of these have been discussed with Pakistan and as a result these have undergone some refinements. Though India controls the entire Siachen glacier, with Pakistani positions to the west of the Saltora range from point 9842, this country has proposed disengagement—India willing to pull out from Zingrulme and Pakistan withdrawing from the Saltora ridge. Significantly, Delhi has said that any disengagement or redeployment of forces would be without prejudice to each other's positions. The proposals stipulates that neither country shall re-occupy the vacated areas or undertake any military mountaineering or other activity in the area. On the nuclear issue, the two countries agreed not to attack each other's installations. India has now proposed no-first use of each other's nuclear capability; non-attack on population centres and economic targets. This is regarded as a step towards eventual non-use and eradication of nuclear weapons. To ensure peace and tranquility along the LoC [Line of Control] in J and K [Jammu and Kashmir], India has proposed several measures to prevent violation of tranquility. Mechanism should be devised to monitor violations by infiltrators and checking cross-border movement of arms. Pakistan has been urged to fix a date for another round of talks. Delhi expects a positive response and would like Islamabad to see the package as a sign of resilience to restore normalcy instead of viewing it as a sign of weakness. Pakistan, with an eye on Washington's moves, has predictably responded by taking a negative stand, repeating the propaganda line on Kashmir and human rights.

* Editorial Criticizes Pakistani 'Mischief' in Kashmir

BK0702120794 Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES
in Hindi 29 Jan 94 p 4

[Editorial: "Time To Say: 'So Be It'"]

[Text] The fact has been reestablished that Pakistan will not refrain from interfering in Kashmir. The world is moving toward peace; if Pakistan's intentions are really peaceful, it should not have rejected India's six proposals without any contemplation or reflection. Although no official response has been received from Pakistan, the way and the impetuosity with which Pakistani Foreign Secretary Shaharyar Khan rejected the proposals—telling the press they said nothing about the important and key issue of Kashmir—shows that Pakistan's claim that it does not assist terrorists in India is a white lie.

At least two of India's proposals are historic. First, India said that peace should be maintained at the Kashmir line of control. Without relinquishing their claims, both sides should—as an interim measure—accept it as the genuine line of control. India's second historic proposal was that neither country should be the first to use nuclear weapons.

Pakistan argues that recognizing the line of control as the genuine line of control would be tantamount to accepting the status quo ante, which runs counter to Benazir Bhutto's pronouncement in a recent address to the nation that Kashmir will one day be a part of Pakistan. Obviously, if Pakistan does not accept this proposal, it means that it considers Kashmir to be its own. To realize this aim, Pakistan is assisting terrorists in Kashmir and sending in infiltrators and mercenaries. India should understand the implications of this and expose Pakistan at the international level. Pakistan objects to the proposal rejecting first use of the nuclear bomb because it wants to keep this option open in the context of Kashmir. Now, when you have reached an accord on not attacking each other's nuclear installations, why should this proposal rejecting the first use of nuclear weapons pose a predicament? Pakistan's intentions are definitely dubious, and it wants to intimidate India. It is with the aim of intimidating India that repeated disclosures have been made that Pakistan has already manufactured a nuclear device. Now why would India—which carried out a nuclear explosion in Pokharan in 1974—be intimidated by such threats?

The best scenario would be for good sense to prevail in Pakistan and for it to accept India's revolutionary proposals. Otherwise, the United States will become active again and harass both countries. It is said that India and Pakistan were on the verge of a nuclear war in 1990, which the United States averted through its able diplomacy. The United States will not repeat this action in the name of charity. This time it will want to exercise control over both countries.

Pakistan is not stopping its mischief in Kashmir. Fresh evidence has come from what happened yesterday. Pakistan carried out a rocket attack on civilian areas in the Punch sector, injuring 27 people. Similar attacks have been carried out for three days in a row. A bomb was found near the line of control that exploded when touched, injuring many school children. The time has come for a limited response to the Pakistani attacks. On 1 February, Benazir Bhutto is going to make venomous statements at the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva about so-called human rights violations in Kashmir.

All of this means that Pakistan is engaged in a campaign to destroy India by all three means—intentions, words, and deeds—and does not want a dialogue. Therefore, we should be able to say: "So be it."

*** Refugee Camps, Suffering of Kashmiri Pandits Recounted**

94AS0212F Calcutta SUNDAY in English 5 Feb 94
pp 60-66

[Excerpts from book by Ex-Governor of Jammu-Kashmir Jagmohan reprinted in SUNDAY as "Refugees at Home"]

[Text] The indifference with which the problems of the Kashmiri Pandit community during the last five years have been viewed by the public in general and the government in particular, is an indication of the poor state of health of our society. Apart from the low level of response to human pain and suffering, other sections of the public have shown little awareness of similar fate visiting them, in one form or the other, if "indifference of the bystanders" persists and callousness continues to dominate the national ethos. "If today, your anguish is not mine, tomorrow my anguish will not be yours."

The History

The Kashmiri Pandits are a community which invites envy at their achievement as well as sorrow at their plight now. In one way, its members have played a dominant role in ruling India after August 1947. In another way, the community has been hounded by a deep sense of insecurity in the Valley. In one way, again, it has been a well-knit community, and, in another way, hopelessly divided and leaderless. The community's long history has been one of triumphs and tragedies—steady and silent triumphs and tumultuous and terrible tragedies. Like Kashmir's weather, the bright, sunny, cool and crisp days have been punctuated by floods and famines and of grey and depressing clouds.

Who Are the Kashmiri Pandits?

About 5,000 years ago, there existed a highly-developed community, with a "profound spiritual culture", along the banks of the river Saraswati, which, according to the

Vedas, was the Mother of Rivers. The Rig Veda (II, 41.16) speaks of it as "the best mother, the best river, the best goddess".

Recent researches, particularly of Dr V. S. Wakankar, conducted with sophisticated instruments such as multi-spectral scanner have clearly established that Saraswati was not a mythological river. It actually existed and flowed from the foothills of the Himalayas, through what is now Thar desert to the Rann of Kutch near the Arabian Sea. It dried up because its main tributary, Sutlej, changed its course, approximately at a right angle, consequent to geological changes.

After the drying up of the Saraswati, the community, which lived on the banks, dispersed. A section of this community comprising Brahmins, Kshatriyas and Vaisyas, moved towards the mountains and finally settled in the Kashmir Valley. Amongst the settlers, the Brahmins soon acquired a pre-eminent position, largely because of their great learning in mathematics, philosophy, astrology and law. In course of time, they came to be known as the Kashmiri Pandits.

Contribution

The mother tongue of the Kashmiri Pandits was Sanskrit, and they made the Valley a great nursery of Hindu culture. Many schools of thought were developed, including the celebrated Trika philosophy, popularly called Kashmir Saivism. The tradition of *guru-sishwa* (teacher-disciple) was firmly established. Every student had to learn at least four Vedas, six Angas, besides astrology, music and the sciences. All this has justifiably given the Valley the name of Saradapeeth—the seat of Sarada, the Goddess of Learning.

The kings of Kashmir and those of the other parts of north India had strong links and were motivated by the same type of cultural and political aspirations. Gonanda, the first known king of Kashmir, was a relation and a friend of Jarasandha, king of Magadha. He was followed by 44 kings. Thereafter, Asoka (272-232 BC) extended his control over Kashmir. Three centuries later, the Kushans established their rule.

They were followed by a number of Hindu kings, including Abhimanyu, Vibhishana and Indrajit. Their names, which are familiar to the readers of *Ramayana*, suggest close affinity between Kashmir and other parts of India. Lalitaditya (721-761), who built the famous temple of Martanda, in honour of the Sun God, and who could be compared to Napoleon in his military skill; Avantivarman (855-883), who was a great patron of men of letters and the founder of Avantipur; and Jaya Simha (1127-1155), who effectuated a "great renaissance", were the three outstanding kings whose contribution to Indian culture, religion, philosophy, art and architecture is truly remarkable. They were admirably served by the Kashmiri Pandits. It has appropriately been remarked that "ancient India has nothing more worthy of its early civilisation than the grand ruins of Kashmir".

The Elites

The Kashmiri Pandits constituted a powerful elite group during the reigns of Hindu kings. Their material needs were mostly met by the royal families and establishments. Such was their influence on society that, by resorting to collective fasting, they could virtually force the monarch to concede their demands, reasonable or unreasonable.

Vicissitudes

In the early 14th century, with the conversion of the then ruler, Rinchana, Muslim rule commenced. As Aurel Stein has noted, "Islam made its headway in Kashmir, not by forcible conquest but by gradual conversion." But coercive methods were often employed and crass fanaticism was not unknown.

The Pandit community underwent its most tragic phase during the regime of Sultan Sikander (1389-1413), who came to be known as "But-Shikan", destroyer of idols. "There was no city, no town, no village, no wood, where the temples of gods remained unbroken."

The Sultan even tried to pull down the famous temple of Martand. A relentless campaign for conversion to Islam was launched, under the charge of the Sultan's chief minister, Malik Saif-ud-Din, who, ironically, was himself a Kashmiri Brahmin before his conversion. As Ferishta recorded, "Many Brahmins, rather than abandon their religion or their country, poisoned themselves; some emigrated from their native homes, while a few escaped the evil of banishment by becoming Mohammedans."

Rajtarangini of Jonaraja portrayed the same tragic reality in these words: "The Brahmins fled. The difficult terrains through which they passed, the scanty food they ate, the painful illnesses and the torments they suffered during their lifetime removed the fear of hell from their minds. Only 11 Pandit families were left."

Maybe the number 11 is only symbolically true; but the fact remains that at the end of Sultan Sikander's rule, the Kashmiri Brahmins were reduced to a microscopic minority. Sikander's policy was continued by his son, Sultan Ali Shah. He, too, remained under the influence of chief minister Saif-ud-Din.

The next Sultan, Zain-ul-Abidin (1420-1470 AD), turned out to be the most benevolent ruler that Kashmir has known. It has been correctly remarked that "history can give few examples where the policy was so completely reversed by the successor. Where Sikander destroyed, Zain-ul-Abidin restored; where the former banished, the latter recalled." Zain-ul-Abidin's reign, following that of Sikander and Ali Shah, was, in the words of historian Srivara, "like the cooling sandal paste after the heat of summer in a desert had departed".

In the end of the 15th century, under the influence of Shams-ud-Din Iraqi, the Kashmiri Brahmins were once again persecuted. The 15th century, thus, turned out to

be one of the most fateful periods in the history of Kashmiri Pandits. Before this century, the community was intact and divided into 199 exogamous *gotras*, the members of which claimed descent from the *rishi* whose name the *gotra* bore. To these *gotras* were now added the distinction between the Kashmiri Pandits who withstood the persecution and stayed in the Valley and those who migrated and later returned. The former were known as *Malmasis* and the latter, *Bhanmasis*.

By the time the Mughal rule commenced in Kashmir, the Pandits had regained their position. They identified themselves with Mughal manners and modes of administration. Their proficiency in Persian, the court language, proved a great asset. The Pandits became the backbone of the structure of governance at the middle level. Their prestige in society was also enhanced by Emperor Akbar's visit to the Martand Temple and offering a cow, with garlands of gold and jewels, as a gift. From the insignificant figure of 11, their number also increased. Their number was estimated by Abul Fazal to be 2,000 during Akbar's regime.

During Aurangzeb's long reign of 49 years, Kashmir saw 14 governors. They generally ruled well. But one of them, Iftikar Khan (1671-1675), persecuted the Brahmins, and they approached the ninth Sikh Guru, Tegh Bahadur. They complained: "We suffer great atrocities, sacred threads (*janeus*) are forcibly taken off our persons. Cows are killed. *Janeus*, a maund-and-a-quarter in weight, are snapped in a single day." The Guru consoled them and said, "Go tell the Mughal rulers that if they converted Tegh Bahadur they would all voluntarily accept Islam." This infuriated the Imperial Court and led to the Guru's martyrdom. And the Sikh faith and history took a new turn.

After Aurangzeb's death, the Mughal empire began to crumble and the Afghans established their hegemony over Kashmir. The last Afghan governor, Jabbar Khan, persecuted the Pandits relentlessly. A Pandit nobleman, Birbal Dhar, unable to see any longer the Kashmiris being tormented and tortured, approached Maharaja Ranjit Singh for help and provided him with valuable information about the strength and deployment of Jabbar Khan's forces. Ranjit Singh had earlier made two unsuccessful attempts to capture Kashmir, once in 1812 and again in 1814. This time, success greeted Ranjit Singh. The Sikh forces, under the able command of Misser Dewan Chand, defeated Jabbar Khan at Shop-ayan on 15 July, 1819, and triumphantly marched into the capital the next day.

The Sikh rule in Kashmir lasted only 27 years (1819-1846). It was followed by about 100 years of Dogra rule, when the British had a decisive say in all important matters.

Migration

Over the years, a sizeable number of Kashmiri Pandits migrated to different parts of northern India. The migration was sometimes sizeable, and at other times in

trickles, depending upon the persecution or discrimination at home and opportunities elsewhere.

Adaptation

In regard to these migrants, Dhanvanthi Rama Rau, in her memoirs, *An Inheritance*, observes: "They were obliged to alter their dress from the loose robes and distinctive headcovering of Kashmiris to the Hindu saris for women and pyjamas and long coats for men, or to the trousers and tunics dictated by the Muslim Mughal Court. However, they continued to cling to their names and the customs, rites and ceremonies that belonged to their community."

The Kashmiri Pandits who migrated were somewhat different from the Brahmins of northern India. While the latter were highly conservative, strictly vegetarian, the Kashmiri Pandits were meat-eaters, scholarly, well-versed in Persian, and both adaptive and traditional.

The Present Tragedy

Whatever be the vicissitudes of Kashmiri Pandits' history and whatever unkind quirks their fate might have brought to them in the past, all these pale into insignificance when compared to what has been happening to them since the middle of 1989. As a part of overall framework of terrorism and subversion in Kashmir, practically the entire community, totalling about 250,000, was made to flee the Valley. The strategy adopted was to "kill one and frighten 1,000".

Canard

When viewed in all its dimensions, the current phase of the Kashmiri Pandits' misfortune is the most calamitous. The grim tragedy is compounded by the equally grim irony that one of the most intelligent, subtle, versatile and proud community of the country is being virtually reduced to extinction in free India. The Pandits are suffering not under the fanatic zeal of medieval Sultans like Sikander or under the tyrannical regimes of the Afghan governors, but they are suffering under the supposedly secular rulers of independent India. What's worse, some politicians and their apologists, whose shallowness is matched only by their obstinacy to suppress documented facts and contemporary records, have been spreading the canard that I encouraged the migration of the Kashmiri Pandits from the Valley.

To bring out the truth about the so-called induced migration and also to delineate the chilling face of Kashmiri terrorism, I can do no better than quote from a letter of H. N. Jattu, president of the All-India Kashmiri Pandit Conference, which was published last year in local newspapers and a leading daily of Chandigarh. It reads, *inter alia*, as follows:

"It is wholly incorrect that I and other Kashmiri Pandits migrated from the Valley at the instance of Shri Jagmohan. The truth is exactly the opposite. Shri Jagmohan, in fact, did his level best to stop migration which had begun

much earlier, when in broad daylight and on busy streets, eminent and innocent leaders of the Pandit community were being brutally murdered and the CM [chief minister], Dr Farooq Abdullah, was taking no action whatsoever or apprehending any culprit. Politician Tikka Lal Taploo was shot dead on 14 September, 1989, N. K. Ganjoo, a judge, was murdered on 4 November of that year and journalist P. N. Bhatt was killed on 28 December, 1989.

"The terror-stricken Pandit community, in a memorandum dated 16 January, 1990, to the then Governor, General (Retd.) K. V. Krishna Rao, brought out the total ineffectiveness of the state government.

"When Kashmiri Pandits were being killed on the pretext that they were 'informers' and agents of the central government, I and some members of the All-India Kashmiri Pandit Conference discussed the alarming situation. After the meeting, I issued a press note on 21 February, 1990, which was published in the newspapers the following day. In this note, I had appealed to the militants not to kill Kashmiri Pandits by labelling them as informers, and if they had suspicion on any Pandit, they should bring it to the notice of our organisation.

"On 28 February, my young and energetic secretary, Ashok Kazi, of the All-India Kashmiri Pandit Conference, was done to death in the most inhuman and savage manner. He was bleeding profusely and crying, 'End my agony by shooting me', but the murderers enacted a sort of death-dance around him and hurled all types of abuses on Pandits. All this happened on a busy thoroughfare. But no one came to his rescue. It was only the distant siren of a police van that made the killers to pump bullets into Ashok Kazi's body and finish him and disappear.

"On the same evening, I was abused over the telephone in the most filthy and unprintable language. Referring to Ashok Kazi's torturous killing, the caller said: 'Have you now got our reply to the press note? You dog, you will meet worse fate than Ashok Kazi.' From that day onwards, members of my community came to the conclusion that we were hoping against hope and must leave the Valley immediately to save our lives and the honour of our womenfolk. And the migration accelerated.

"On the other hand, Governor Jagmohan, who took over on 19 January, 1990, tried very hard to persuade us not to leave. He fervently appealed to the Kashmiri Pandits, who had already migrated, to return to the Valley. He even offered to set up four temporary camps for them at Srinagar, Anantnag, Baramulla and Kupwara. This would be evident from his press note of 7 March, 1990, which was widely published at that time.

"A number of other energetic steps which have now become a part of history were taken by Shri Jagmohan to retrieve a hopeless situation. At great personal risk, he visited the police stations in thickly-populated areas where the police machinery had totally broken down. To instill confidence in the highly demoralised Kashmiri

Pandit community, he even went to the house of young Satish Tikka in Habbakadal, a congested and terrorist-infected locality.

"He consoled the old parents of Satish, who was brutally murdered after being called out in the street by his erstwhile friends. The Union home minister acknowledged all this when he said in Parliament on 25 April, 1990: 'Jagmohan had to function in a vacuum, in a situation where there was no respect for law or authority of the state government. He braved terrorists, instilled courage in government officials who had almost given up the situation as a lost case. It is very unfair for anyone to criticise Jagmohan for what he has done for the country.'

"When an all-party committee, headed by deputy prime minister Devi Lal visited Srinagar, myself and Shri J. N. Sapru met him and the Union law minister Shri Dinesh Goswami, at Centaur Hotel, where the party was staying. We apprised them of our horrible plight—how we are living under continuous fear of death, how threats and hysterical slogans of *Nizam-e-Mustafa*, etc. were blared simultaneously from hundreds of loudspeakers installed on the mosques, how hit lists were being displayed on the notice boards and how our womenfolk were being dishonoured. We also met Shri Rajiv Gandhi and spoke to him on similar lines.

"The waiters of the hotel, most of whom had turned collaborators of the militants on account of internal subversion, were listening. The director-general of police and the additional director-general (CID) came to know that the waiters had informed the militant leaders about what transpired at the aforesaid meetings. We were already on the hit list and they decided to intensify their efforts to get us immediately, so that punishment for speaking about their atrocities were carried out speedily. The director-general of police and the additional director-general thought that there was no effective way of saving our lives except to shift us to Jammu till conditions improved for our safe return.

"In the meanwhile, treacherous and brutal killings of innocent Kashmiri Pandits continued in the Valley. Those killed included prominent persons like engineer B. K. Ganjoo, poet Sarvanand Premi and his young son, Virender Kaul, professor K. L. Ganjoo and his wife and a teacher, C. L. Pandita. Press notices were prominently put out in widely-read dailies of Srinagar, namely, AFTAB and ALSAFA, requiring Kashmiri Pandits to leave within 48 hours, failing which they would run the risk of being exterminated. Photocopies of these notices have been printed by Shri Jagmohan in his well-known book, *My Frozen Turbulence in Kashmir*."

In the face of the above hard evidence, which remains un rebutted till date, could there be any doubt about the intentional falsehood coined about the migration of the Kashmiri Pandits from the Valley?

Wayward and Infirm State

I am confident that, had I not been stabbed in the back by the most repugnant lies spoken in contemporary history, like those in regard to the Kashmiri Pandits, I would have built, during my second tenure, the same bonds of love and affection with both Hindus and Muslims, through selfless service and a clear and consistent policy of fairness, firmness and fearlessness, as I was able to do during my first tenure (April 1984-June 1989).

Those who have any doubt about this proposition should go through the reports of reputed national dailies of early May 1990. By that time, the corner had been decisively turned. The militants were on the run. The people had themselves started erasing pro-Pakistan and pro-aazadi slogans from the walls of public buildings and private houses. The capital, with thousands of government employees, including Kashmiri Pandits, had been shifted to Srinagar without a scratch on any head. Unfortunately, the wayward nature of the Indian state once again came into play and all the advantages secured were wantonly thrown away.

It speaks volumes about the infirmities of the Union government that it has created about 250,000 refugees in its own country, and that it is not their human rights violations, but those of the terrorists, that are usually discussed at the national and international fora.

Most of the Kashmiri migrants are staying on scanty relief, in miserable camps in Jammu, Nagrota, Udhampur and other cities. The children go to badly-maintained schools with hardly any furniture. The women have to cook in the open, even under the scorching sun or heavy rainfall.

That, during the last four years, none of the Prime Ministers—V. P. Singh, Chandra Shekhar and Narasimha Rao—have felt the prick of conscience to visit any of these camps shows how compassion has completely dried up in the minds of the Indian rulers. For them, politics is everything, justice and truth nothing.

It goes to the credit of the Kashmiri Pandit community that, even in such indifferent environment, it has not lost heart. Its various associations have been voicing their grievances vigorously and trying to get across the barriers of government apathy. A recent example of this phenomenon was the World Kashmiri Pandit Conference, organised in New Delhi, on 27 and 28 December, 1993, by Panun Kashmir, an organisation which is dominated by the youths.

National Concern

While it should be left to the community and its various organisations to sort out their differences on the blueprint for the future—whether they want a separate Union Territory within the Valley or they want to go

back with honour and dignity, with terrorism and subversion totally exterminated—it is the duty of the government in particular and the Indian public in general, to stand by the community and relieve it of its distress in the shortest possible time. Its pain should be felt as national pain and its anguish as national anguish. We must all remember that "the only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing." [Box, p 62]

The Strangest Night

I went on working in the secretariat and returned to Raj Bhavan late in the evening of 20 January, 1990. The night that followed was the strangest night that I have ever lived. Hardly I had gone to bed when the two telephones at my bedside started ringing, almost continuously. At the other end, there were voices of alarm, of concern, of fright, sometimes muted voices of men too terror-stricken to speak.

"Tonight is our last night," moaned one voice. "By morning, we—all Kashmiri Pandits—would be butchered," said another voice. "Send us aeroplanes; take us out of the Valley; evacuate us at night if you do not want to see our corpses in the morning," pleaded another. "Our womenfolk, our sisters, our mothers, would be abducted, and we menfolk slaughtered," shrieked yet another voice.

Some callers told me that they would just hold on to their telephones so that I could hear the terrible slogans and exhortations that were emanating from hundreds of loudspeakers fitted on the mosques. The noises, they said, were deafening and it appeared that a number of recorded tapes were being simultaneously played at a very loud pitch, causing horrible effects in resonance and permeating the atmosphere with terror and fear of imminent death.

What was it all about? How is it that such a large number of loudspeakers had been installed and the same calls were being made from them? How was this technique of arousing mass frenzy acquired? Who had masterminded this well-knit organisation? And how was it that such a build-up remained unnoticed? Was it a case of default or connivance or both?

(Extracted from Jagmohan's book, *My Frozen Turbulence in Kashmir*) [Box, pp 64, 65]

A Treacherous Murder

On 2 February, 1990, Satish Tikoo, a young Kashmiri Pandit, was murdered near his house in Habbakadal. He was a social worker, an activist, who helped the people of his community secure redressal of their grievances. He was equally popular amongst the Hindu and Muslim youths of the locality.

Early in the morning, two Muslim youths, whom he apparently knew, called at his residence. His sister responded to the call. Sensing something sinister, she

told the visitors that Satish was not at home. They went away, but lurked around the adjacent lanes. After a while, Tikoo came out of his room. His sister mentioned to him about the youths who had come to see him. He got a bit annoyed, and reprimanded his sister for being too suspicious. He could not imagine that someone had planned to kill him.

He stepped out of the house and peeped into the adjoining lanes and by-lanes. In a moment, a dreadful pistol shot was heard. The family rushed out. They found Tikoo in a pool of blood, motionless.

The brutal murder of Satish Tikoo was another blow to the already shattered morale of the Kashmiri Pandit community. This was bound to accelerate the pace of their migration which had been going on since the assassination of N. K. Ganju, Tikka Lal Taploo and P. N. Bhatt.

To generate some confidence in the community and to offer condolences to the bereaved family, I decided to visit Tikoo's house the following day. Accordingly, on the evening of 3 February, I went to Habbakadal, an old and congested locality in the interior of the city. By that time, the curfew relaxation period was over. Except for the long row of our vehicles, nothing was to be seen on the streets. The afternoon rain appeared to have soaked the houses with depression. The few windows that were open were without even the usual dim light. The dark clouds overhead completed the picture of gloom.

"It is very unwise on our part," said a companion officer, "to move out like this in narrow lanes. A well-planned grenade attack can finish us all." I nodded in agreement. But my mind was elsewhere—the slush and muck on the road; the threatening clouds above; the mute and dingy houses by the side of the road, and the overpowering silence all around.

The house of Tikoo was like a shattered nest. Everything lay scattered. I sat on the ground with the family members. An old lamp had been lit. It pierced the darkness only around me. Satish's father narrated the tragedy in a low, halting, voice. I thought it was unnecessary. The grim atmosphere around told the tale more vividly.

As I was about to leave, all the friends and relations of the family gathered there, demanded with one voice that they should be settled permanently outside the Valley. Satish's uncle, who was a bit vociferous and assertive, insisted that I should go upstairs and see the family deity. I agreed.

A calm majestic figure was soon visible. It looked so imposing even in the darkness. The man, his voice quivering with emotion, said: "Here we have lived for centuries under the benign grace of this deity. This house, this street, this lane and this by-lane, where we have lived since our birth, we can leave, but not this deity. You must provide us with suitable accommodation." I remained silent. This, I thought, was not the occasion to discuss such demands. With tears in their

eyes, the family members thanked me and the accompanying officers. We were all moved by the sad plight of the family.

Looking at the compact and enmeshed houses, and the by-lanes which acted like fine threads of a well-knit fabric, I wondered how these families, who had all their gods and goddesses here, and had deep roots in the soil, could leave and settle in distant and unfamiliar lands. Sometimes life is unaccountably cruel, and we human beings have, perhaps no option but to suffer—suffer in silence, or wail.

On 22 March, 1990, B. K. Ganjoo, a telecom engineer living in a Muslim-dominated locality in Srinagar incurred the wrath of the terrorists in the Valley. He had been warned by his neighbours that his name was on the hit-list, so when the terrorists burst into his house looking for him, he hid in a drum used to store rice. Not finding him in the room the terrorists riddled the drum—and his body—with bullets. After that, they asked his wife to cook the rice and feed it to the family.

A few days earlier, 30-year-old Navin Sapru, a central government employee, was returning home from office when terrorists sprayed him with bullets. A woman passer-by pleaded with them to spare him, but they pushed her aside and danced around the man who lay writhing in pain. As the sorrowing relatives took away Sapru's body, the terrorists followed them in a truck, right up to the cremation ground, singing and dancing till the body was reduced to ashes.

The stories abound. "*Tum kehie ho kagaz dekhi, main kehia hoon aankhen dekhi* (You only talk about what you have read, but I talk of what I have seen with my own eyes)," said Dr Agni Shekhar, quoting the poet Kabir, at the 1993 World Kashmiri Pandit Conference in Delhi. He went on to relate the tales of atrocities committed on the Kashmiri Pandits in Kashmir—of which he and three lakh other refugees, scattered in camps in Jammu, Amritsar and Delhi, were eyewitnesses—and there was not a dry eye left at the Siri Fort Auditorium.

The situation was charged with drama. An elderly man, weeping inconsolably, had to be ushered out. Noted film actor Anupam Kher asked for the lights to be switched on in the dimly-lit auditorium. "The Kashmiri Pandits have suffered enough in darkness," he intoned, in a voice choked with emotion.

"Our stories are as horrifying as those of Bosnia," said Dr Agni Shekhar, the convenor of the conference. "It is a case of ethnic cleansing, of cultural genocide. These are new terms for India, but our tragedy is a unique one."

According to Shekhar, more than 1,200 Kashmiri Hindus have been killed in the Valley, some 1,600 houses burnt and over 50 temples destroyed in the last four years. Over three-and-a-half lakh Kashmiri Pandits have fled the Valley, most of whom are now living in camps.

And these refugees are a bitter lot.

"It is tragic that we are called 'refugees' in our own country," said Sushil Raina, in the camp at Amar Colony in Delhi. The camp houses 60 Kashmiri Pandits who sleep, cook and live in one large hall. Raina had his own medical store in Kashmir. But one day in 1990 he received a death threat. He didn't know who had sent him the threat, nor was he interested in finding out. Scared for his life, he slunk out of his house in the middle of the night.

This M.Sc. is now selling meat and chicken in Delhi's INA market. The rest of his family—his parents and sisters—have fled to Bangalore.

Vijaya Zutshi, a young mother of two girls, cooks food in her make-shift kitchen, and matter-of-factly relates her tale—which could be that of any other Kashmiri Hindu family—"My husband ran a courier company in Kashmir. One night, four men with guns knocked at our door. My husband jumped the wall and ran away. Next day, we all left."

The Zutshis are among the more fortunate families: they have, at least, a corner of the hall in the camp in Delhi's Amar Colony to call their own. The single men are not so lucky. They have to make do with as much space as their bedrolls occupy. The hall resembles a railway platform, except, these people have nowhere to go.

The camp in Delhi's South Extension is worse, with more than 250 people crammed into a small hall. The only things these people can call their own are the walls of these camps, plastered over as they are with newspaper clippings of militant deaths in the Valley.

But one doesn't really need these to read the writing on the wall. Here are men who owned apple orchards and saffron farms back in the Valley, forced to steal out of their homes because they refused to obey the cry "*Kashmir mein rehna hoga, Allah-ho-Akbar kehna hoga* (If you want to stay in Kashmir, you must embrace Islam)."

And now, they have to make do with an average income of Rs 1,200 to Rs 1,500 a month. That is, if the migrants are lucky enough to find jobs at all. Otherwise, they have to depend on a government dole of Rs 250 per head. Or Rs 1,000 per family, irrespective of its size.

They have been waiting for nearly four years for the government to do something about their lot. "All that we have got is indifference and apathy," burst out Ashok Barbazoor angrily. Barbazoor worked for 21 years at the Oberoi Hotel in Srinagar, and claims he earned nearly Rs 10,000 a month. Now, he sits idle. "I burnt Pakistani flags in Jammu, and now I am paying the price for my nationalism. All I have to say is 'Pakistan, zindabad', and I will get my house and land back."

It's the kind of experience that is at the bottom of all the knee-jerk bigotry in the country. "So much hue and cry over one mosque being brought down here," sneered Barbazoor. "What about all the Hindu temples that were

burnt in Kashmir? This government wants to show it is a democratic one, and so is pandering to the minorities."

Alleged S. L. Shakhdar, chairman of the action committee group, Kashmir Samiti, "There is discrimination even among the refugees here, with the Kashmiri Pandits getting a raw deal. The Punjab migrants get a dole of Rs 300 per head. And the Afghani refugees get Rs 700 per head, from the Indian government, in addition to Rs 800 from the United Nations."

"For so long, the government has been saying 'We'll send you back,' and doing nothing but molycoddling the terrorists," said one refugee. "Look what happened in Hazratbal. They set the militants free in the stealth of the night." "If they can't give us back our land," cried another, "we will take guns and fight for it." His cry was echoed by the surrounding Kashmiri Pandit youths: "Train us to fight and we will solve our own problems."

Another solution being advocated is the one for a separate homeland for Kashmiri Pandits. This demand comes loudest from the Panun Kashmir Group (founded in 1991). Explained its chairman, Dr Agni Shekhar, "Panun means 'our'. We are asking for our homeland, a place where Pandits will be safe and can call their home."

Realising the improbability of the militants ever leaving the Valley, the organisation is asking for a homeland comprising the regions of the Valley to the east and north of the river Jhelum.

In addition, they want the homeland to be accorded the status of a Union Territory, under the Constitution of India but minus the controversial Article 370, which has been applicable to the rest of the state since November 1952.

"Panun Kashmir is a translation of our aspirations," said Dr Agni Shekhar. Added Dr Ajay Chungroo, spokesman for Panun Kashmir, "Over three lakh Kashmiri Pandits were pushed out of the Valley. We deserve a home, and by concentrating us in a particular part of the Valley, it will be easier for the government to protect us as well."

Gautam Kaul, DIG Personnel, Central Industrial Security Force agreed: "The demand for a separate homeland must be seen in its totality," he said. "It is the demand of despair. And it would not have come if the central government had not ignored the entire issue. Having a patch of sterilised area free from militants is a simple way of solving the situation."

But the migrants in the camps do not take to the idea of a separate homeland. "What they are asking for is a division of Kashmir. This means that Kashmir is lost to us," said Raina. Added Barbazoor, "It is not possible to live in isolation by asking for a strip of land. We have to interact both professionally and socially with our immediate neighbours. How can we exist in a vacuum?"

While the Panun Kashmir members shrug off the migrants' point of view ("They have orchards and property all over the Valley and so, don't want to be restricted to a particular area," explained one Panun Kashmiri), others, like former Governor of Jammu and Kashmir, Girish C. Saxena, concur with their argument against a separate homeland.

"The idea (of a separate homeland) does not take into account the realities of the situation," said Saxena. "One can understand their frustration and despair, but the foundation of the return of the Kashmiri Pandits to the Valley can only be on the basis of goodwill and welcome by the majority community in the Valley. And this can only be established through government negotiations."

He went on to caution, "These negotiations take time. Even in Punjab, thousands of people and industries were displaced, but eventually they have all gone back to their own homes."

It is ironic that Panun Kashmir, an organisation that claims to be voicing their demands, did not take their views into account when it asked for a separate homeland. "And what is worse, they are spending lakhs of rupees hosting a world conference, when they could have distributed the money among the refugees," said Barbazoor. (Panun Kashmir claims it is funded by its branches in America and Europe, and by various Kashmiri Pandits in India as well.)

Agni Shekhar rose to his organisation's defence: "It is necessary to hold conferences to highlight our problems. Also, our organisation is not for meeting day-to-day needs, but has a long-term goal."

As for the day-to-day needs, "The migrants do have some sort of a cushion to fall back on in the form of the camps," said Saxena. "True, these can be improved upon, but these people all come from an affluent background, and so their expectations are much more than what is being provided."

The Kashmir Samiti, which manages most of the refugee camps, has helped in looking for employment. Out of the 10,000 families in the 17 Delhi camps, around 3,000 people are working as sales agents, teachers, engineers and even shopkeepers (Delhi's INA market is full of Kashmiri migrants-turned-shopkeepers).

Vijaya Zutshi's husband works as a school-teacher, earning Rs 3,000 a month. "In Kashmir," she said wistfully, "we had two houses. Now we have to make do with his small salary."

Some philosophical souls are more than making do. A few stray layabouts are already in evidence. Happy with the government dole and whatever part-time employment that comes their way, they loiter around the camps, dressed in not-so-old sweaters and trousers and talking about the latest Hindi moves. These youths have also found their own alternate lifestyles in exile.

In the meantime, the government needs to step up its rehabilitation programmes. "There should be relaxation of age to all dispossessed migrants," pointed out Gautam Kaul, "to compensate for two years' loss in education. Let them treat us like Scheduled Tribes."

This is the other aspect of the mass exodus of the Pandits from the Valley: the cultural and social loss to the nation. According to Vijay Tikku, Panun Kashmir member, "Modern Kashmir owes a lot, particularly in the fields of literature, art and dialect—its very *Kashmiriyat*—to the Kashmiri Hindus. The Pandits in Kashmir go back over 5,000 years. Our language, the Sharda language, is the oldest regional language in India."

Although the Valley, which accounts for 3,000 square miles in a state comprising 84,000 square miles, is predominantly inhabited by Muslims, there is little difference in the language and dress of the Hindus and Muslims residing there. But now the Kashmiri Hindus are claiming that since they were the original inhabitants of Kashmir, they are responsible for its cultural identity. "The Muslims in the Valley have adopted the Sharda language. If the Pandits do not return, then the original Sharda script will become influenced by Pushto and Afghani dialects," laments Kaul.

In order to hold on to their *Kashmiriyat*, the migrants have been making paintings, sculptures, writing Kashmiri folk songs—resulting in what they term "art in exile". "With these paintings and creative literature, we want to tell the rest of India, 'This is the community you have killed'," said Agni Shekhar.

Four years after the debacle in their lives, the Kashmiri Pandits languish in their camps, but not without a desperate bid to go home.

* Congress(I) Seen Unable To Defend National Interest

94AS0212B New Delhi ORGANISER in English
30 Jan 94 p 11

[Article by V.P. Bhatia: "From Arm-Twisting to Leg-Twisting of India Over Kashmir"]

[Text] In his *The Story of Philosophy*, rated as "one of the best loved works of our time", the celebrated American author Will Durant relates the following incident from the life of a Roman philosopher Epictetus as a classic example of stoicism or quiet acceptance of pain and defeat as one's pre-ordained lot in life: "Story has it that Epictetus' master, who treated him with consistent cruelty, one day took to twisting Epictetus' leg to pass the time away. 'If you go on', said Epictetus calmly, 'you will break my leg'. But the master went on, and the leg was broken. 'Did I not tell you', said Epictetus mildly, 'that you would break my leg?' And that was the end of the matter. [quotation marks as published]

It is some such sort of mystic philosophy of tolerance, we are told by historians, that the Hindus had been practising in medieval times to survive the Islamic onslaught. And it is again some such sort of secular philosophy of surrender to Islamic subversion and crossborder terrorism that the nation is being advised to put up with in order to prove our civilisational superiority to Islamic theo-political offensive again so that our rulers can enjoy the fruits of freedom in undisturbed calm even while bartering away vital national interests at every step.

However, to cover up rank cowardice, mealy-mouthed sermons are delivered to the nation, reminding one of a heartless judge's advice to rape-victims that when they can't do anything about rape, it is better to relax and enjoy it!

No wonder, as the self-serving secular hypocrisy strikes more and more weird poses of servility, Pakistan's arm-twisting of India turns to leg-twisting. As the wager of Islamic *jihad* is fully backed and encouraged by its patron-in-chief with a new cowboy, Bill Clinton, in White House, the proxy war threatens to take the shape of an atomic holocaust of India unless the secularists offer the whole of Kashmir on a platter to propitiate the Islamic Moloch. It is another matter that the people of India are still quite capable of facing the multiple threats.

Obviously and no Government even offers to surrender Kashmir unless bent on *hara-kiri*. But then you can bank on secularists to devise new foxy ways of covering up surrender under grandiose terms like "autonomy" and "self-administration", as the secular opinion-makers and writers mount a surreptitious pro-Paki and pro-American campaign for "timely solution" of Kashmir problem to avoid disintegration of India, although such a "solution" would hasten disintegration.

So we are told by Kuldip Nayar in his column in THE STATESMAN (December 29, 1993): Fortunately there is a sea-change in Indian opinion. Whether it is because of unending militancy or the growing feeling that force is no solution to people's alienation, the climate in India is in favour of making concessions provided it does not mean the secession of the Valley. There is also the realisation that the country cannot progress without peace in the continent." [quotation marks as published]

The so-called opinion-makers are obviously happy that the secular gangs have successfully alienated the Kashmiris and now urge de facto "Azadi" for them. After expulsion of all Hindus they are all for creating a new Islamic nation. So why not cut the head to get rid of the chronic headache.

This reminds one of Urdu poet Ghalib's oft-quoted verse:

Ab to ghabra ke yeh kehtay hai ke mar jayen ge, Mar ke bhi chain na paya to kidhar jayen ge.

—That is, "In a fit of life's frustrations, we yearn to seek escape in death, but where shall we go if even death does not bring the coveted peace."

So what if even a constitutional regression in Kashmir from the quasi-independent status of Article 370 to semi-independent status of Nehru-Abdullah agreement of 1952 or three-subject accession of October 1947 does not prove to be the final solution? What if the crusaders continue the battle for full Islamic independence and accession to Pakistan of which there should be no doubt if one remembers what even Nehru had said that Kashmir is only a symptom of Pakistan's religious disease and it will find some other pretext to badger India if it gets it on a platter. Even Kuldip Nayar has reported in his book *Distant Neighbours*, that Hate India is the very basic creed of Pakistan and superiority of Islam and hatred of Hindus as *kafirs* the very sheet anchor of its existence.

However, just now the stand of the worshippers of terrorist force and opinion-makers like Nayar that "climate in India is favourable for making concessions" because of "unending militancy" is no different from Bhutto Government's at the recent Indo-Pakistan talks in Islamabad that India should "swallow the bitter pill" of secession of Kashmir because of "changed ground realities"—changed by the Pakistan-directed proxy war, of course. The only difference between two stands is that while Pakistan wants to amputate the leg, the Indian secularists would like to keep it dangling to the Indian body after breaking it.

Many would however call it head-hunting if you remember that Kashmir is always projected as the head of Bharat Mata. Meanwhile, the progress of arm-twisting to leg-twisting to head-hunting by Pakistan and its American godfathers forms a great success story of Nehruvian secularism, which though a totally failed remedy, is being administered with ever bigger doses to the sick nation.

There is much song and dance, meanwhile, that China has changed its stand of all-out support to Pakistan on Kashmir issue whereas fact is China is against only the third option of independent status of Kashmir as it would become an American base against it, otherwise it has forged even stronger defence ties with Pakistan to checkmate India. Besides supplying missiles, it has pushed lakhs of AK-47 rifles at damn cheap rates for terrorists' use in the region. Clinton's controversial letter to Ghulam Nabi Fai, President of a pro-militant and pro-Pakistan Kashmiri outfit of USA, is no less significant as it makes the American stand all the more a pro-Pakistan. So now you may hear more hue and cry on Plebiscite and self-determination even in UNO.

However, the real solution of the problem still lies in the hands of India, only if it sheds the secular blinkers. There will be no respite to it unless it learns to look grim realities in the face. The back of secessionist militancy has to be broken swiftly and ruthlessly, even as Pakistan

did in Baluchistan even by bombing of rebel areas. But the pity is that the Centre goes about everything touching Muslim intransigence in a circumlocutory and dilatory fashion, painfully prolonging the agony of everybody by avoiding the hammer-stroke of determined army action, without political interference.

What is needed is a clear signal to Pakistan that it would destroy itself if it insists on annexing Kashmir. For Kashmir-fixation is bound to spell the destruction of Pakistan, whatever the price India has to pay for its nuclear toys. A dire signal is also needed for Kashmiri politicians to agree to full integration by abrogation of Article 370 or face imposition of Union Territory status for the valley and merger of the rest of the state to Punjab and Himachal. In any case, militancy in the state is kept alive as much by Pakistan as by the pampered crypto Pakistanis of the valley. This phoney secularism needs to be unmasked and secessionism punished instead of being rewarded with massive bribes.

In any case, people of India will never accept what Kuldip Nayar dubs as public opinion but is really the official opinion. India has to stop behaving as "a poor-man's wife who is the common property of all neighbours". For that is the unenviable status "progressively" achieved by India since the leftist inspired Chinese aggression of 1962. The outraged nation's long-oppressed spirits are waiting to be uplifted with a cataclysmic fury. There are enough silver-linings in the dark clouds.

Till then, Pakistan's spirits are hugely uplifted by the Dutch courage of its nuclear toys.

Meanwhile, Pakistan's notorious secret agency ISI is operating freely from our territory, treating the whole of India right up to Assam and other states in the North-east as its happy hunting ground and creating secure bases in all big cities to set off new serial blasts. Using even Bangladesh and Nepal and maybe Sri Lanka also, it has given the latest signal of its omnipresence from Hyderabad in the south where a big gang engaged in another dangerous plot, a foretaste of which was given by five train explosions on December 6 last, the first anniversary of Ayodhya demolition, is said to have been busted by Indian intelligence.

Meanwhile, despite all hue and cry about ISI's [Pakistani Intelligence Service] hand in the last March's mayhem in Bombay, Pakistan is not the least harmed or bothered about our impotent rage. On the other hand, it accuses our own politicians of being hand in glove with the arch culprits, Dawood and Memon brothers who are alleged to have been allowed to escape soon after the car bomb blasts of which clear hints were available by unusual activity on the preceding night. So like Dogberry and Verges, the classic models of stupid policemen in Shakespeare's *Much Ado About Nothing*, the Congress regime seems to be happy to be rid of the botheration of arresting the villains of the piece. While the suspicious of politician-mafia nexus is strengthened by the Sharad

Pawar-Chavan tussle over the handing over of the whole enquiry to the centre, the sense of relief over the villains' timely exit seems to be palpable. It is such stuff that Indian secularism is made of.

No wonder, the Pakistanis, apart from our own crypto-Pakistanis are the most ardent admirers of our self-defeating secularism. A Pakistani editor actually expressed surprise over this strange phenomenon. Perhaps he did not know how the visiting Mohajirs themselves have been feeling green with jealousy at the licence enjoyed by their co-religionists whose leaders never tire of wailing about genocide of Muslims in India even while claiming five to eight-fold increase in their population since independence as against three-fold increase in general. They also have reason to gloat over the ethnic purge of Hindus from Kashmir even while welcoming massive infiltration from Bangladesh to inflate their vote-bank.

Meanwhile, to frighten the Hindu population in general and pseudo-secularists they keep threatening the Boshianisation of the whole of India by communal flareups, bomb-blasts, terrorist violence on the plea that the Muslim youth was getting impatient of constitutional ways.

No wonder, the hard-pressed Hindus administered a shock therapy by way of demolition of the Islamic imperialist totem at Ayodhya. More shocks treatments may follow as a logical corollary if the Islamic sins go on piling up further with secular connivance. Their BSP-SP [Bahujan Samaj Party-Samajwadi Party] Trojan horses are unlikely to help them as the Hindu psyche is basically the same in this matter among the backwards, forwards and the Dalits.

No wonder, even intellectual giants like V. S. Naipaul and Nirad Chaudhuri have welcomed it as a Hindu mass upsurge. This reminds one of Huxley's description of D. H. Lawrence's attack on conventional morality in *Lady Chatterley's Lover* as shock treatment. The hue and cry raised over it, said Huxley, showed that it had successfully gone home. So, he urged more and more such shocks so that now we find no modern novel respectable without fierce attacks on "Grundism".

Thus it is that the Hindu temperature rises as Islamic votebank is relentlessly propitiated and appeased with ever new baits despite a clear writing on the wall about its fundamentalist mission. And again, thus it is that every Pakistani blackmail and breach of diplomatic norms is swallowed as mother's milk by our philosopher-kings despite open declarations of *Jehad* not only to annex Kashmir but to terrorise and blow-up the rest of India. For, to finish the unfinished business of partition, is their openly proclaimed aim. And as co-fathers and creators of the Islamic state of Pakistan, with touching paternal love for its stability and welfare, our Congress rulers treat even its most dangerous moves as no worse than the pranks of a spoilt child.

* Murli Joshi Interviewed on Kashmir Solution

94AS0212C New Delhi ORGANISER in English
30 Jan 94 pp 3, 13

[Interview with Murli Manohar Joshi, former president of BJP (Bharatiya Janata Party), on 5 January; place not given: "Government Has Allowed Internationalization of Kashmir Issue"]

[Text] When I went to Srinagar to hoist the National Flag there the Islamic fundamentalist terrorists had infiltrated even into the administrative machinery of J&K [Jammu and Kashmir] government. They had established a large number of training centres, and they had also attracted the imagination of a large number of young people who were constantly interacting with Pakistan. Some of them demanded Independence, some others wanted to merge J&K with Pakistan. Normal life had been disturbed, terrorism was in full swing and the authority of the Indian government had completely eroded. I thought that in a part of our own country, in Kashmir Valley, people, Kashmiri Hindus, have been squeezed out of their hearths and homes and rendered homeless. What is this government sitting in Delhi and Srinagar? How is it that the government has lost the sensitivity to react to the situations? There is no concern for those unfortunate but patriotic people. All the political leaders heard the slogans of *Pakistan zindabad...* "Indian dogs get out of the Valley", and other anti-India outpourings. The posters carrying such slogans were appearing on the walls. Then there was a massive anti-India propaganda, hate-India campaign on Kashmir all over the world. Our security forces were painted one of the most inhuman forces, brute forces violating all human rights. The government in New Delhi was pumping money, crores, hundreds of crores in Kashmir Valley. But despite all this generosity nobody could dare personally go and hoist the National Flag in Srinagar any day—Independence Day or Republic Day. A certain feeling and sense of despondency was descending on the people of Jammu and Laddakh also as there was nobody to raise a little finger against the terrorists. Therefore, the Party (the BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party]) decided that I should go to Srinagar and hoist the National Flag in order to emphasise India's basic unity and integrity. We wanted to tell the whole world that India is indivisible.

You cannot say that this is Kashmir, this is this, this is that. These divisions are for administrative set up but culturally, emotionally and historically, India, including Kashmir, is one. As I discovered during the Ekta Yatra, even in the remotest corner down south the sentiment on Kashmir is same as in the rest of the country—north, east or west. The main objective of the Ekta Yatra was to emphasise this positive side of the Kashmir problem and to educate the people about the harm and damage which was done by retaining all these years Article 370 which has sowed the seeds of separatism.

My analysis was that the major problem arises because of this Article under which Kashmir appears to have been

given a separate status, separate from other States. The continuance of the Article was responsible for separatism in Kashmir, said Shri Murli Manohar Joshi, former President of BJP, in an interview to ORGA-NISER on his sixtieth birthday, January 5.

Excerpts.

[Question] The government is having talks with Pakistan on Kashmir. what is your view about it?

[Answer] Regrettably the government has not acted wisely in handling Kashmir affairs and has provided a handle to separatist, anti-India elements in Kashmir. The most unfortunate part of government's policy (on Kashmir) is that Kashmir which was only a bilateral matter, under the Shimla Pact, has been allowed to become an international issue. Now, many countries are coming and trying to sponsor their services to mediate and United States and some of its representatives have even questioned the accession of Kashmir State to the Indian Union. They say that entire Kashmir is a disputed territory. This is because Government of India could not initiate talks with Pakistan. The GOI should have forced Pakistan to the negotiating table and asked for withdrawal of Pakistani forces from the occupied Kashmir as provided under UN resolutions. The UNCIP appointed by UNO had held that the accession was legal and valid.

[Question] You mean UN resolution also called for withdrawal of pakistani Army from PoK?

[Answer] Yes. But GOI never demanded the withdrawal of Pakistani forces.

[Question] What would you suggest? Should the government hold talks?

[Answer] Talks or no talks...that is not the issue. Well, first GOI should be in a position to create a favourable world opinion. All those countries which were supporting India till now have become non-interested. Even Russia which was extending blanket support in the past has withdrawn. Now, once you accept that Kashmir is a disputed territory, what about Sikkim? China does not think it is part of India. Arunachal also, China feels, is not a part of India. This is a design to destabilise India. Therefore, the basic question is that of country's integrity.

[Question] Against this background what do you think can be a solution?

[Answer] There are so many options being talked about. Some say, give Kashmir more autonomy, some feel borders should be made more porous. Some say Valley should be put under international control for some years. Some are thinking of independent Kashmir, some say that let Kashmir go to Pakistan. All sorts of solutions are coming up. These solutions are being talked about because the GOI has shown weakness in handling the

Kashmir issue all these years. Had it dealt with the issue firmly there would have been no Kashmir problem today.

[Question] The situation being so alarming, has the Party any other immediate plank on Kashmir?

[Answer] Yes, I feel the soul of India must be stirred once again. To remain quiet on the new U.S. stance on the issue will be suicidal. Due to elections and other reasons the reaction of GOI was not so sharp as it should have been.

[Question] It is said that Hazratbal episode gave BJP a very good chance to bring the Kashmir issue to the fore but BJP wasted it?

[Answer] As I have told you, there were elections at that time. But still, all through the election campaign we focussed on Kashmir and told the people of government's surrender to militants.

*** Chavan Discusses Pakistani Disinformation**

94AS0190L Madras *INDIAN EXPRESS* in English
31 Jan 94 p 10

[Text] Jammu—Union Home Minister S.B. Chavan has said that Pakistan, which has been supporting and instigating terrorism in Kashmir, has no moral right to raise the issue of alleged human rights abuses by security forces in the Kashmir valley.

Talking to newsmen at the Jammu airport before his departure to Delhi after his three-day tour of Jammu and Doda region, Chavan said that Pakistan has launched a massive disinformation campaign against India at the international level, whereas large-scale human rights violations are taking place in other parts of Pakistan, he said.

The Union Home Minister admitted that India has not been able to effectively counter the false and motivated campaign by Pakistan. He said that the government has taken a number of steps to put across the Indian point of view on the Kashmir issue at the international level.

"We even propose to send non-government organisations to other countries to put across our case in the wake of "wild allegations levelled against our country," he said.

Chavan further said that after the strike call given by the Pakistan government on the Kashmir issue no further proof was needed to show the complicity of Pakistan in fomenting trouble in the Kashmir valley.

On the question of alleged use of excessive force at Kupwara, Chavan said that clear-cut instructions have been given to the security forces to show utmost restraint in dealing with such provocative situations. He said that an inquiry has been ordered by army into the episode also.

Asked about the demand for appointing political advisors Chavan categorically said, "We do not propose to appoint political advisors." He said that Kashmir was a national issue and he would expect co-operation from all political parties to frame a common "strategy." No political party should try to exploit it for its "political gains," he added.

About holding elections in the state, the Home Minister said that he has never ruled out holding elections in Jammu and Kashmir but no time limit could be given.

Chavan said that he did meet Farooq Abdullah in Delhi for half-an-hour but refused to give further details about what transpired.

He also announced that the monthly relief to the Kashmiri migrants has been raised from Rs.1000 per month to Rs.1500 per month. "The decision was taken after I had a talk with the Union Finance Minister Manmohan Singh on telephone last evening," he said.

He said that he would also take up with the Finance Ministry the problems of overdraft, deficit and security related expenditure incurred by the state government. He further said that unless more aid was given to the J and K it would be difficult for the state to meet its annual plan targets.

About his perception of the situation, he said that security forces are handling it in a co-ordinated manner which has not only given confidence to the government but also to the common man."

Asked to comment upon the reported statement of Pakistan Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto that Kashmir would soon be part of Pakistan, he retorted, "It is their wish only."

* Government Policy Faulted in Kashmir

94AS0211A New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 1 Feb 94
p 4

[Editorial: "Home Minister's Visit to Kashmir"]

[Text] It would be unrealistic to hope that Home Minister Chavan's visit to Kashmir to review the situation there would improve the law and order situation and that terrorism would be controlled. The firing by the terrorists on the home minister's caravan in Doda proves that the roots of terrorism are very deep in Jammu-Kashmir. Chavan, who visited Jammu and Doda, said that he felt the people there wanted to join the national mainstream, but are afraid to speak because of their fear of rifles. The central leaders have been making such statements continuously for the last three years. After their trips to Jammu-Kashmir, the central leaders always conclude that the people there do not support the terrorists, but are afraid of revenge and lack the courage to speak up. The question arises: Whose job is it to take away the guns that are aimed at these people's heads? Who is responsible for arresting the terrorists? If it is the

government, then what is the use of making such statements? Do not government officials understand that they are sending the wrong message to the Kashmiri people by telling them we are helpless, and that we do want to help them, but are not strong enough to deal with the terrorists? The image that is presented to the world is that India has no influence here, and the people here want to get out of India. This is the image that Pakistan presents to Western and Muslim nations. The home minister said that the government is willing to talk with the Huriat Conference and other separatist groups on the condition that they give up violence and be prepared to talk according to the Indian Constitution. We do not know who the home minister is trying to fool. The groups that thrive on the belief of separatism and who believe in violence and military methods will not accept the home minister's condition and be prepared to commit suicide.

Chavan said that the attractiveness of terrorism was increased because these youths were unemployed. Therefore, the government would increase opportunities for employment. This is also looking away from reality. Even if we grant that unemployment is a cause for increasing violence, how can we provide opportunities for employment in this atmosphere of violence and anarchy? In Jammu-Kashmir, especially in the Kashmir Valley, administration is in name only. All business is idle, and industrial production has stopped fully. Government and non-government offices do nominal work, and two years of education in schools and colleges is not completed even in five years. No industrialist is willing to invest money in the state. Even the home minister himself has admitted that foreign contractors responsible for building the hydroelectric project in Dulhasti have given up the project out of their fear of violence. In this atmosphere, what kind of miracle will Chavan, Rajesh Pilot, or Farooq Abdullah pull to create new jobs? The only miracle they can pull is to silence the guns of the terrorists. But the preliminary preparations the government should have made have never been done. The local and central police are in a precarious condition, while the terrorists have spread their communication network all over the state. In this situation, the security forces' efforts to rout the terrorists are like chasing their own shadows. Usually, innocent citizens suffer in these efforts. Until the central government gives up its much-abused cliches and forms an effective strategy to end the anarchy in Kashmir, it will not be able to get out of this mess, nor will it be able to show a path to the people.

* Dialogue With Kashmiri Militants Urged

94AS0212H Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English
1 Feb 94 p 8

[Article by Nikhil Chakravarty: "Drawing the Line of Control"]

[Text] Once again Kashmir has become a centre of utmost concern both at home and abroad. The latest focal point of the Kashmir crisis is the border township of Kupwara where an army operation against militants

led to the killing of about 30 persons. This in turn led to the *bandh* called by the civilian population which described the operation as a "massacre" by the Indian Army. Government offices, business establishments, banks, post offices and shops were closed throughout the valley—one more proof of the alienation of the people from the Indian government.

This has come as a severe blow for the Centre. Its isolation in the trouble torn valley has been exposed just when the Pakistan government is likely to raise the issue of human rights violations by India's security forces in Kashmir at the session of the United Nations human rights commission which began yesterday.

Now more than at any other time, the record on human rights is certainly negative for India. In the early Sixties, there was a direct diplomatic offensive by the United Kingdom-United States combine leading to the Duncan Sandys mission that bluntly advocated the vivisection of Kashmir. But the crisis that time was not triggered off by any armed secessionist movement within Kashmir. It arose from India's disastrous confrontation with China over the border dispute leading to armed aggression by the Chinese army. Pakistan, in concert with its international patrons at the time, sought to exploit India's isolation on the international plane.

In contrast, this time the near total isolation of India within the Kashmir valley itself is being exploited by Pakistan. Unlike the situation in 1962-63, this time the key to any solution of the Kashmir crisis lies with India to a large extent.

It is well worth noting the drift that has overtaken the Indian government's Kashmir policy in the last one year. One can question with good reason if the present government has a Kashmir policy at all. Three months ago, New Delhi's stand was that there had to be an Indo-Pakistani dialogue for a real solution of the Kashmir crisis. It was argued that unless the training and arming of the militant secessionists was stopped there could be no solution. Normalcy in the Kashmir depended on an Indo-Pakistani understanding.

Against this background, Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao's message of greetings to Ms. Benazir Bhutto on the occasion of her becoming prime minister in October 1993 and the latter's friendly response were thought to be positive signs the Kashmir problem could begin to be tackled.

Then came the protracted siege of the Hazratbal shrine by the Indian Army. It showed up an amazing lack of coordination and common understanding among the various arms of the government right at the ground level. This could hardly be papered over by official denials. In fact, the full story of the Hazratbal episode has not yet come to light, particularly the manner of its settlement.

Nevertheless the resolution of the Hazratbal issue opened up new possibilities for some initiatives both at home and abroad. In Kashmir itself, the emergence of

the Hurriyat outfit aiming to bring about a rapprochement between the government and the militant groups offered a golden opportunity. For the government could find a new approach to solve the problem: within Kashmir itself.

But the opportunity was not used. Instead, the army was given the go-ahead to launch a military strike against the militants. The Sopore operation destroyed the chances for any dialogue with the militants. The government itself did not seem unified in its assessment of the way to handle the Kashmir crisis.

On one side is the hardline lobby that frankly takes the stand of no-truck whatsoever with the militants. This school thinks that the militants can be wiped out and thereafter the people in the valley brought over to the side of the authorities. There is another school within the government, or rather the political establishment, which realises there can be no solution to the Kashmir crisis through mere armed action. It stresses the need for political initiatives.

Undoubtedly nowhere in history has an insurgency been quelled by sheer force. The military can only contain militancy, not eliminate it. However, New Delhi seems to be caught in a dilemma of its own making. It is trying to handle the most explosive of all its problems without having worked out a clear policy. It has been trying to respond to events rather than initiate any policy decision.

A careful analysis of New Delhi's reactions to events in Kashmir in the last one year makes it clear that the government has largely depended on the US administration to pull up Pakistan and force it to curb its aggressive designs on India. This dependence is based on the premise that since the Cold War is over, New Delhi cannot be accused of relying on Moscow. Since the government has also been making a thorough effort to dismantle the Nehruvian legacy of economic self reliance and openly inviting US corporate giants to invest in this country and capture even the home market, it expected an era of *bonhomie* between the two countries.

The finance minister, Mr. Manmohan Singh, has assiduously pursued a policy of total subservience to the World Bank prescription of free market economics. He naturally expected this to fetch political dividends. This anticipation has dominated the government's entire thinking on international affairs. But the assumption Washington would recognise India's worth as its largest loyal camp follower in south Asia was naive.

An illusion was also fostered that the US administration would listen more to New Delhi than to Islamabad on any issue of contention between India and Pakistan. That was why greater labour was spent by Indian diplomats and the government to canvass for India's case on Kashmir in Washington than make any serious attempt to open a worthwhile dialogue with its neighbour.

Even when US state department underlings like Mr. John Mallot and Ms. Raphael made offensive remarks about India's position in Kashmir, the Indian government held on to the illusion it would be able to persuade Washington to brand Pakistan as a "terrorist state". Instead came the two missives from the US president, Mr. Bill Clinton, to two non-descripts. This clearly showed his bias for the militants not only in Kashmir but in Punjab as well.

What seems to be totally missed by policy making pundits in New Delhi is that the US administration has never claimed to be a Santa Claus distributing goodies to third world destitutes. It has always maintained its *realpolitik* for mastery over international affairs and economics, more so after the collapse of its rival superpower, the former Soviet Union. It has never made the mistake of announcing the abandonment of its aspirations to world hegemony. In that design, the emergence of a stable, powerful India can only be a nightmare rather than a benign force.

An unstable India in constant friction with its neighbours provides the ideal setting for Washington's policy on south Asia. At the tactical level, Indian diplomats should have realised the present prime minister of Pakistan has long maintained the closest relations with the Democrats in the US. This relationship enabled her to work out a businesslike relationship with the powerful military junta in Pakistan which has never snapped its close links with the Pentagon.

Given this alignment of forces, any government in New Delhi has to try its hardest to open a dialogue with the militants in Kashmir. They should be offered autonomy short of secession from the Indian Union. To discuss and negotiate there has to be a ceasefire. Dialogues with all groups of Kashmiris have to include representatives of the refugee intelligentsia as well.

And once the Indian government plucks up the courage to make such an offer to Kashmiris who are citizens of India whether they are militants or not, it can be in a position to call upon its Pakistani counterpart to make a similar offer to Kashmiris on the Pakistani side of the line of control. This would represent a healthy competition between the two countries to win over the hearts of the inhabitants of paradise on earth.

*** 'Conspiracy' To Embarrass India Over Kashmir**
94AS0197E Madras THE HINDU in English 2 Feb 94
p 6

[Text] New Delhi, Feb. 1—The recent killing of the first non-combatant officer in Kashmir and last week's incident at Kupwara are part of a conspiracy to embarrass India at the U.N. Human Rights meet which opens in Geneva today, according to senior officials here.

The slaying last month of the Border Roads Organisations [BRO] officer, Major Bhupinder Singh, is seen as an attempt to provoke a violent response from the

security forces which could then be denounced before a global audience at Geneva, as proof of India's disrespect for human rights.

"After February 15 when the global spotlight from Geneva wears thin, the violence here is bound to taper off," said a highly-placed source.

Returning alone (unlike other uniformed personnel, BRO officers often travel without an armed escort) after supervising road clearing in snow bound Kashmir, Major Singh was waylaid near Verinag on January 17. His bullet-riddled body was dumped by the roadside the following Sunday. It also bore visible marks of torture.

Outraged peers call the slaying "the grossest violation of human rights." Fellow officers recall Major Singh's obsession with pushing road building in the Himalayas, a perfectly civilian friendly activity. With three road building projects in the troubled State, the BRO is a major employer in the region.

The young Sikh officer with an infectious sense of humour was a daredevil who preferred to travel alone, his colleagues say. "When will the locals with whom he was so friendly break their silence and with it the militants will to heap atrocities," they ask.

Hiding her anguish, his wife, Abnash Kaur, tries to reconcile herself to the loneliness which lies ahead. Too young to fathom the tragedy, daughters Nirmat (11) and Robina (7) are oblivious to the uncertain future they now face. Rewards varying from Rs. 50,000 to Rs. 1 lakh have been announced to apprehend the culprits, one of whom has been identified.

Singh's colleagues say the newly-formed pro-Pakistan outfit, the Hizbul Ansar (made up of the Harkat Ul Mujahideen and the Harkat Ul Jihad-al Islami) is behind his killing. They claim that competition among the militants to obtain rewards from the Pakistan Inter Services Intelligence (ISI) could be another provocation for the killing.

Demonstration of "results" on the ground releases a flush of funds and weapons from across the border. When the squeeze on militants tightens in the winters (snow-bound passes block infiltration routes) brutality can reactivate support from outside, they point out.

*** Pakistan Said To Blackmail U.S. on Kashmir**
94AS0206A Madras THE HINDU in English 3 Feb 94
p 8

[Article by Pran Chopra]

[Text] Is Pakistan trying to shut the door on future negotiations with India? That, in plain language, would be the meaning of the stand it has now taken on Kashmir, if it decides to stick by that stand.

It has stated that the next round of talks between the two countries must focus on the modalities and time schedule for holding a plebiscite in Kashmir. Such an agenda can be agreed upon between the two countries only if, and only after, they have agreed, at least in principle, that a plebiscite is to be held and the time has come to sort out the modalities. Since no agreement of the kind has been reached as yet and none is in sight, the agenda stipulated by Pakistan puts the cart before the horse.

Why has Pakistan done so? One part of its motivation is clear enough. By making such a proposal Pakistan is trying to convince what remains of its constituency in Kashmir that it is still working for the Valley's exit from India. It is also trying to convince the people of Pakistan that while the Mujahideen may have failed to tire India out of the Valley, Pakistan has not lost its zest for its parallel tussle with India on the diplomatic front. Nor has it lost diplomatic initiative despite India making the first move in suggesting a substantial and constructive agenda for the next round of talks between the two countries.

There is very little India can or needs to do about this part of Pakistan's game plan. It is a matter which lies between Pakistan on the one hand and on the other those who have put their faith in Pakistan's ability to undo, by one means or another, the State's accession to India. India can only wait while they come to terms with the realities. India's concern needs to be more with what Pakistan may be attempting to convey to the United States by these tactics.

What Pakistan is seeking to do at that level is to blackmail the United States and other peace-makers into putting further pressure on India on its behalf, and by that means to scare India into making further concessions quickly in order to spare itself the pain of these pressures. This is a subtler game than Pakistan has played so far, which makes it all the more necessary for India to avoid either of the two opposite kinds of diplomatic fumbling, one by showing too much flexibility and the other by showing too little. Too much would only whet the appetite of Pakistan and the secessionists, too little would narrow the opportunities which have opened up in Kashmir thanks to the recent successes in the fight against terrorism.

The blackmail Pakistan is attempting may seem to be convoluted. But its logic is quite simple, and it may well persuade those decision-makers in Washington who, as recent events have shown, are either intentionally unfriendly or lack the knowledge or the patience to understand the complex situations in far off South Asia.

An important part of Washington's concern about Kashmir has long been known to be an outcome of its concern over the nuclear intentions or capability of India and Pakistan. The argument it puts forward is that so long as the issue of Kashmir is not resolved, there will always be the risk of a war between the two countries,

and in anticipation of it each country will be tempted to arm itself with nuclear weapons. That will only aggravate the possibility that either may use them, whether preemptively or when faced with imminent defeat in a conventional war.

Pakistan is now playing judo with this argument, by using its force to flip it over and stand it on its head. It has been proclaiming from the highest policy-making levels—for instance through Mr. Moeen Qureshi when he was the Prime Minister of Pakistan, and much favoured by the American establishment because of his commitment to economic liberalisation, and more recently through the current Foreign Minister—that there is a linkage between Pakistan's nuclear policy and its demands regarding Kashmir.

More simply stated what this means is that if America is interested in forestalling a conventional war in South Asia which might escalate into a nuclear war, then it must pile more pressure on India until Pakistan's demands with regard to Kashmir are met. Reluctant as yet to go along with that, the United States has been urging both countries to enter into purposeful talks. But talks do not suit Pakistan's book. A deadlock does, and better still a breakdown, because then Pakistan can resume the game of playing upon America's anxiety to prevent any serious escalation of the risk of war by neutralising India on Kashmir.

India checkmated Pakistan when it not only agreed to put Kashmir on the agenda of the recent talks but also accepted Pakistan's demand that this subject be given a separate and pre-eminent slot. India gained some more when Pakistan admitted that the talks on Kashmir had been "serious." And then, even before that round ended, a distinct possibility arose that the two countries might yet put themselves on the track of substantial and long-term negotiations because India indicated its willingness to make a series of proposals, some on very substantial issues, and from which much good could come for both countries if the talks continued to be serious and purposeful and if Pakistan refrained from making the Indian proposals a hostage to its own.

Pakistan has now tried to stymie that chance with its demand that the focus of the next round of talks must be on the modalities of a plebiscite. Pakistan probably expects that it stands to gain no matter which way India moves. If India accepts the demand, Pakistan earns the gratitude of the secessionists. If India rejects it, Pakistan can proclaim that the negotiating exercise has been thwarted by India, and India must be subjected to further and perhaps terminal pressure, while Pakistan escapes the embarrassment of having to discuss India's six proposals. Pakistan is simultaneously trying to give teeth to this logic by stepping up military actions along the border to make it look more likely that the only alternative to America pressing India harder diplomatically would be a military conflict in South Asia.

Therefore it is necessary for India to move on a dual track. On the one hand it must prepare itself, seriously and sincerely, for the next round of talks. To this end it should consider whether there is any way it can further enrich its own proposals, and at the same time hold its patience if Pakistan insists on putting the modalities of a plebiscite on the agenda. If and when that item is reached there will be time enough to argue the absurdity of it, but it must not be India that turns its back on the negotiating table.

At the same time Indian security forces must avoid the kind of overreaction they committed on January 27 because it plays straight into the hands of Pakistan's scare tactics.

On the other track India must anticipate the blackmailing of America which Pakistan is sure to begin as soon as it can find an excuse to say that it is India which has brought the talks to a dead-end. This again will require simultaneous movement on many axes. Despite the insensitivity or ignorance of many in the American administration, and the prejudice of a few, the actual score on the negotiating table must be kept as clearly before as many Americans as may be possible.

This will test India's own patience also of course, and the competence of the lobbying agency which has just been engaged will have to go through an early baptism of trial under fire.

A tougher axis will be for the effort which must be made at the same time to carry conviction with America at the highest level, that while India will go as far as it possibly can to win back the confidence and allegiance of the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir—especially now, when the situation on the ground is rather more auspicious than it was before—it will not place the State either at the disposal of Pakistan's ambition to complete what it holds to be the "unfinished task" of partitioning India along religious lines, nor will it make the State available for any next generation of strategic games that the United States might be cooking up, as China suspects it is, against the new enemy America is inventing for itself.

But the toughest axis is going to be the one on which India will have to make up its own mind on what and how it will face whatever it might have to face once it decides that it cannot bow any further to American interests or prejudices.

India has already seen on the economic front that even a good policy like deregulation of the economy can do much harm if it has to be tailored constantly to the values and demands of those who pull the strings, and is not governed sufficiently by India's own needs and conditions for optimum benefit. But such harm is nothing compared with what can ensue if in an abject and unwarranted spirit of helplessness India gives in to pressures on Kashmir which may be wholly incompatible with the country's territorial and, what is more important, social integrity. After doing its best for

obtaining America's understanding, India must learn to do without it if that becomes necessary.

* U.S. Intentions on Kashmir Issue Questioned

94AS0211B New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 4 Feb 94
p 12

[Article by Dinkar Shukla: "Clinton Creates Doubts Regarding His Intentions in Kashmir"]

[Text] New Delhi, 3 February—Three former foreign secretaries of the Indian Government believe that the Clinton government's designs for Kashmir are not sincere. They believe that by repeatedly raising the question of human rights violations in Kashmir, the United States is planning a big game. Is it working toward establishing an independent Kashmir? In response to this question, former foreign secretaries C.S. Jha, Maharaja Krishan Rasgotra, and A.P. Venkateshwaran all agree on one thing: India should be alert to U.S. plans. These three foreign secretaries are the same people who, in a joint communique last week, accused the United States of interfering in India's internal affairs.

The three former foreign secretaries told JANSATTA in the context of their joint communique that President Clinton, his senior assistants, and administrative officials issued statements during the last year that create just one image. It is clear that the U.S. administration's concern about human rights violations is superficial. The real reason is different. If we look at it within the framework of the United States' long-range strategy and defense plans, then we can understand it. Mr. Venkateshwaran referred to the 25 January inaugural speech given by President Clinton to a joint session of the House, in which he emphasized the importance of maintaining his country's supremacy in international relations. According to Mr. Rasgotra, with the end of the Cold War, the United States is moving forward with the idea in mind that the whole world is under its control.

Mr. Jha thinks that because the Democrat government is facing defeat on every front of foreign policy, it is worried, and perhaps President Clinton wishes to show some accomplishment on the Kashmir front. But trying to gain something there at the cost of India's unity and oneness will be very dangerous. There will be serious results, including the disruption of peace in this area, confrontations between India and Pakistan, and damage to our secular and democratic structure of government.

The three former foreign secretaries also believe that there is another reason for the U.S. attitude toward India: India's refusal to sign the NPT [Nonproliferation Treaty]. The Clinton administration is very angry about this. Mr. Jha and Mr. Rasgotra said that India does not have to accept U.S. pressure. After China became a major nuclear power and Pakistan attained nuclear capability, it would be meaningless for India to sign the NPT. Such a step would be suicidal.

Mr. Rasgotra suggested that India should oppose U.S. pressure. This is important for our national interest. He said, "We may be weak and poor now; however, we do not have to accept pressure from anyone." He said that the NPT was written in 1968. India has maintained its nuclear option since then. It should stay firm on its policy.

The three former foreign secretaries said that India is not a minor country; rather, it is the largest democracy in the world and the second largest country in terms of population. Mr. Venkateswaran believes the Indian Government is to blame for the current situation. It has quietly tolerated external interference in Kashmir and other areas, especially U.S. interference. He accused the Narasimha Rao government of not caring for the nation's pride because it lacked self-confidence.

*** Article Proposes Solution to Kashmir Problem**

BK1402124594 Delhi *INDIAN EXPRESS* in English
5 Feb 94 p 8

[Article by Kuldip Nayar: "The Bilateral Approach"—quotation marks as published]

[Text] Policy-makers in Islamabad are apparently unaware of the sea-change in the Indian scene on Kashmir. After many years, the people, the press and most political parties are in a mood to have a settlement with Pakistan. They are generally on the defensive whenever Kashmir crops up because they are not happy over all that is happening in the valley.

On the other hand, never before had the government considered Kashmir a disputed territory as it has done now even in a roundabout way. The Shimla Agreement, which is India's Bible on Indo-Pak relations, specifically mentions a final settlement on Jammu and Kashmir and New Delhi has adhered to the formulation. Even after declaring from the ramparts of Red Fort on the Independence Day that Kashmir is an integral part of India, Prime Minister Narasimha Rao wrote a letter to Pakistan Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto proposing talks, including Kashmir as a subject.

As promised in Islamabad during the abortive meeting between the foreign secretaries of the two countries, New Delhi has sent a package of six proposals to improve the relationship. They may not be ideal ones. But they concede some ground, which can be expanded.

In contrast, Pakistan's response has been hysterical. It has declared a country-wide hartal [strike] for February 5. Benazir Bhutto has already gone to the UN Human Rights Commission accusing India of having committed excesses in Kashmir. And her foreign minister has threatened a nuclear war if Kashmir is not settled.

All this is familiar. This time the rhetoric is more shrill than before. Otherwise, it is the same exercise which Islamabad has gone over many a time.

Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the late Pakistan prime minister, too had threatened a 1,000 year war. Yet the same Bhutto turned so peace-loving that he not only agreed to convert the cease-fire line into a line of control but also hailed it as 'a line of peace'. He signed the Shimla Agreement to consecrate a bilateral approach. He said he was sick of going to the world chanceries for help. After the 1965 and 1971 wars, he realised that he would have to sit one day with India, across the same table, to settle all disputes, including Kashmir.

Islamabad, under the leadership of his daughter, Benazir Bhutto, has taken a different course. It has unilaterally repudiated the Shimla Agreement. It has said that future bilateral talks will be aimed at finalising 'the modalities for holding plebiscite in Kashmir'. But clause VI [Roman 6] of the agreement had mentioned 'the modalities' in connection with 'the establishment of durable peace and normalisation of relations, including a final settlement of Jammu and Kashmir'. Nowhere does plebiscite figure.

Assuming that Pakistan wants nothing but a plebiscite, it surely realises what it is in for. While proposing plebiscite, the UN had laid down certain conditions. One is that the entire State of Jammu and Kashmir will come under the control of India. This means that Pakistan will have to vacate not only 'Azad Kashmir' but also areas like Gilgit and Baltistan, which are now its integral part. (China too will have to vacate the Kashmir territory, which General Mohammad Ayub Khan had given to it in 1962).

Two, the armed forces of Pakistan will have to withdraw from 'Azad Kashmir', Gilgit and Baltistan, leaving behind only a contingent of Indian forces to enforce law and order. Three, normalcy in the State must return before a plebiscite is held.

It is difficult to imagine Islamabad complying with these conditions. The people in Pakistan will never agree to the handing over of 'Azad Kashmir', Gilgit and Baltistan even temporarily. And Pakistan should note that there is no time-limit for normalcy to return.

New Delhi too cannot go back to plebiscite because it will revive religious animosities. When a referendum in the North West Frontier Province (NWFP) was held in 1947 to determine whether it should go to India or Pakistan, the choice got reduced to whether the Muslims wanted to vote for the Gita or the Koran. India cannot afford to rip open old wounds. Its battered secularism following the demolition of Babri Masjid cannot withstand any more knocks.

Both countries face a difficult situation. I am reminded of what Jawaharlal Nehru told Zulfikar Ali Bhutto in London in November 1961: "Zulfi, I know that we must find a solution for Kashmir. But we have got caught in a situation which we cannot get out of without causing damage to the systems and structures of our respective societies."

Another development which has taken place in the last few years is that the Kashmiris want independence. When India and Pakistan agreed to a plebiscite in 1948, the choice was confined to joining either India or Pakistan. Islamabad has repeatedly said that it wants the Kashmiris to decide about their future. Will it agree to the third option? And, is an independent Kashmir a tenable proposition? After all, the Maharaja of Jammu and Kashmir wanted his state to be independent after the British left but failed in his endeavour. Pakistan never accepted the idea.

The only solution possible is a settlement which may displease all the three, India, Pakistan and Kashmir, but may go some way in assuaging their sensitivities. One proposal is to soften the line of control so that the bona fide nationals of the state living in Kashmir and 'Azad Kashmir' become one people. They should enjoy autonomy except in defence and foreign affairs. Both subjects should continue to vest in India and Pakistan in their respective parts of Jammu and Kashmir.

The nationals of India and Pakistan should be able to visit the state by getting a visa—the Indian citizens from Islamabad to go to 'Azad Kashmir' and the Pakistanis from New Delhi to visit Kashmir. This arrangement is not an ideal one but it may enable the people on both sides to meet more often at least in Kashmir. It is quite possible that one day the high walls that fear and distrust have raised on the border will crumble and the people of the subcontinent, without giving up their separate identities, will work together for the common good.

* Editorial Asks if Pakistan Seeks War Over Kashmir

94AS0210A Jalandhar PUNJAB KESARI in Hindi
7, 8 Feb

[Editorial in two installments: "Is Pakistan Provoking India in Order to Instigate a War?"]

[7 Feb p 4]

[Text] The relationship between India and Pakistan has been full of tension for some time. India's relations with the United States are also becoming tense. Not only Indian, but foreign newspapers have also written a lot about the tension among India, Pakistan, and the United States of America at international level. Analyses are being made at international levels on this situation. Let us first discuss the tension between India and Pakistan.

The day Benazir Bhutto became Pakistan's prime minister a second time, she started to spew poison against India over the Kashmir issue. Recently, in Davos, Switzerland, and after her return from Geneva after attending the Human Rights Conference, Benazir Bhutto spoke against India continuously to international and national correspondents with regard to Kashmir. Benazir, who is nervous about her "civil war" with her brother and her mother, has started to emphasize her statements against India in order to divert the attention

of her country and of opposition parties from her family. Bhutto has also been encouraged by the United States to speak out against India. Benazir also knows that U. S. President Clinton is opposed to India. Why is that? I will go over that later; however, after Pakistan failed in spreading terrorism in Punjab, all Benazir had left with her to condemn India all over the world was her "one-point program" on Kashmir.

The way the Indian government started to pressure various terrorist groups in the Kashmir Valley; the way these terrorists had to submit after the Hazratbal incident; and the way Pakistan's efforts to encourage terrorism at the international level was exposed have all pushed Pakistan to start efforts to spread unrest in Kashmir across the actual line of control. On one side, across the actual line of control, rockets are fired toward the Indian side. On the other side, bombs are set off in Jammu and Kashmir, and sensitive areas like TV towers are burned. We do not know how many times terrorist groups attacked our security forces in that state during the last month. The time has come for the ice to melt, and thousands of trained terrorists are waiting to cross the border into India.

While the terrorist groups are misleading the youths in Kashmir, Pakistani troops are shooting rockets loaded with time bombs into Indian territory. Recently, Pakistani-trained terrorists led an early morning organized attack in Kutwara city and forced security forces to shoot back in retaliation. Twenty-one people were killed in this exchange of fire, including three members of the Jammu-Kashmir police. The Hizb-ul Mujaheddin and the Jamat-ul Mujaheddin both started to raise a hue and cry over this and began to propagate that atrocities were being committed against Kashmiri Muslims. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto also agreed with them and began to beat a drum at the international level that the Indian government was committing atrocities against the Kashmiri people and violating their human rights. A few days ago, a bomb went off in a Kathua movie house, killing two people and wounding 23 others. Pakistan is not worried about the people who were killed or wounded by that bomb blast, nor are any of the terrorist groups in the region. However, when the security forces take any action in their defense or to protect the people, then it is propagated that the Indian government is committing atrocities against the Kashmiri people. The international conspiracies hatched in Jammu-Kashmir are only aimed at attaining one goal: protecting the seat of power in Pakistan and keeping the attention of the Pakistani people focused on Kashmir. This gives Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto time to issue anti-Indian statements in the United Nations and the UN Human Rights Commission. She tells them, "Look at how the Indian government is committing atrocities against Kashmiri Muslims!"

Can there be another goal for Pakistan? Does Pakistan want to start another war with India? Is the Pakistani army inciting India to start a war? According to Indian

military intelligence sources, we cannot deny the possibility that the Pakistani army is inciting India into war by shooting rockets across the India-Pakistan control line. According to intelligence sources, the Pakistani army, by shooting rockets in that region, is diverting the Indian armed forces attention from fighting the terrorists and is trying to divert their attention toward the Pakistani army. The intelligence sources claim that with the new wave of terrorism in Jammu-Kashmir, the Indian armed forces and security forces are busy dealing with terrorist acts. This will facilitate the entry of thousands of trained terrorists into the Kashmir Valley. The Pakistani army will take advantage of this opportunity and will take control of part of Indian territory. That means the Indian army would have to start a war with Pakistan to get those areas back. This way, two battle fronts will open in Kashmir. In this situation, when the Indian army is not getting cooperation from the Kashmiri people, and Pakistan is getting sympathy at the international level—including the United States of America—the United States will be able to pressure India on this issue, and Pakistan will be showered with new modern weapons and dollars. Using this pretext, Pakistan will be able to continue its Islamic bomb program, and during this period, Benazir Bhutto will be able to strengthen her position as prime minister. If we analyze Jammu-Kashmir and Pakistan's present situation closely, then the facts related above support the hypothesis that an international-level conspiracy is being implemented against India. Are the Americans involved with Pakistan in this conspiracy? Is not this a conspiracy to stop India from emerging as an economic power in South Asia? The anti-India international powers have perhaps begun to feel that after India has successfully suppressed terrorism in Punjab, sooner or later, terrorism in Kashmir will also end, and Pakistan will be defeated there also. What kind of attitude does the only superpower in the world, the United States, have toward India in this whole situation? I will talk about this in the next installment of this article.

[8 Feb p 4]

[Text] Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and the Indian Foreign Ministry are now clear on the fact that President Clinton's policy on India-Pakistan relations and Kashmir and Punjab is against India. It was noted in the past that whenever there was a Democrat as president in the United States, U.S. government policy was neither opposed to India nor in support of it. American policy on Kashmir was always neutral. The Republican presidents have always implemented anti-India and pro-Pakistan policies. During John F. Kennedy's and Jimmy Carter's administrations, the United States had neutral policies about India. During the eras of Nixon, Reagan, and Bush, the United States encouraged Pakistan to spread an anti-Indian tirade and keep the Kashmir issue alive. Perhaps this is the first time in the history of United States-India relations that a Democrat, President Clinton, has adopted an anti-India attitude on Kashmir, Punjab, and India-Pakistan relations fronts. Have the

attitudes of Democratic Party leaders changed regarding India, or has India failed to present its case appropriately to the United States? Whatever the reason, the United States tried to control India's economy through the World Bank recently and has given up its neutral position on the human rights issue of Kashmir and Punjab. The way the United States is encouraging Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto to spew poison against India clearly indicates its changed attitude toward India.

In light of this changed situation, India also started to speak out against U.S. high-handedness. Prime Minister Narasimha Rao opposed U.S. economic, political, Kashmir, and Punjab policies in his speech in Davos, Switzerland. This was perhaps the first time since the late Mrs. Gandhi that an Indian prime minister used such words against the United States. The situation at that time was very different. At that time, India had the full support of the Soviet Union. At this time, however, it is surviving at the mercy of the United States, which is controlling the politics of the entire world. Prime Minister Narasimha Rao's speech and the hints sent by our Foreign Ministry to the United States have made it clear that India does not like U.S. interference in its internal affairs.

The way India has expressed its reaction to the United States' anti-India policies makes it clear that there is a lot of tension between Delhi and Washington. Both sides will have to work very hard over the next few days to ease this tension. President Clinton is fully responsible for the problem in U.S.-India relations. The way he issued pro-Pakistan statements about Kashmir and Punjab against India has disappointed the Indian government.

This is perhaps the first time that the United States has failed to appoint an ambassador to its embassy in New Delhi. This can give us an idea of how important India is to the president of the United States. It was heard before that former Senator Stephen Solarz, who is pro-India, could be appointed ambassador to India. If this happens, there would be efforts to improve relations between India and the United States. Neither the U.S. administration nor President Clinton, however, have made a final decision about this. The situation has deteriorated so much now that Indian Ambassador Siddhartha Shankar Ray in Washington and our Foreign Ministry have been forced to believe that Prime Minister Narasimha Rao's proposed trip to the United States should be canceled. Mr. Rao had planned to visit the United States in February. There are still plans for Mr. Narasimha Rao to meet with Bill Clinton; however, according to Foreign Ministry sources, if President Clinton is so convinced against India on the Punjab and Kashmir issues that he is making open statements at the international level, Mr. Narasimha Rao's trip to the United States and meeting with Clinton will not yield any positive results.

As for India, the terrorism in Punjab has almost ended. The situation there has improved, and Punjab is making

economic progress. A year ago, India's Foreign Ministry complained that the way terrorism was ended in Punjab under Narasimha Rao's leadership, and the way the U. S. policies opened the Indian economic system to the international market will cause the young U.S. President Clinton to praise India and invite our prime minister to visit the United States. He is the prime minister of the world's largest democracy and was visiting other countries. But the U.S. president did not invite him. Instead of praising Mr. Rao, Mr. Clinton encouraged propaganda against India.

It is surprising to learn that Clinton, who is the president of the world's only superpower, still believes there is terrorism in Punjab and that rights are violated there. The whole world knows that the situation in Punjab has changed over the last two years and that peace has been established there. The controversial letter that Mr. Clinton wrote to Ghulam Nabi Fai, who is president of the Pro-Pakistan Kashmir Council in the United States, and the way anti-India propaganda was accelerated in U.S. policy, forced Mr. Siddhartha Shankar Ray to threaten that if the U.S. government's attitude remained anti-India, then the Indian prime minister would cancel his trip to the United States. Such talk from the Indian ambassador and our foreign ministry will not have much of an effect on a powerful nation like the United States; however, by telling this to the United States at the international level, we have at least demonstrated our pride in independent policies. This step is praiseworthy.

In my personal opinion, after the United States started its propaganda against India, it was the first time our Foreign Ministry responded strongly to it. Before this, all U.S. decisions were considered as new laws by the whole world. India is the only country in the world with the courage to tell the United States, the policeman of the world, that India is fully alert to human rights and democracy, and that it will not accept external interference in this area. What will be the result of India's bluntness? How will it affect Indo-U.S. relations in the future? Will Pakistan's position become stronger because of the India-Pakistan tension? It is natural for such questions to arise; however, at this point, the most important question is of India's pride and self-respect. If we have to pay a heavy price to protect our pride and self-respect, we should be fully prepared to do so.

*** Commentary on Pakistan's 'Nefarious Game Plan' in Kashmir**

BK0902134394 Delhi All India Radio General Overseas Service in English 1010 GMT 9 Feb 94

[Commentary by journalist Kanchan Gupta]

[Text] At a time when Pakistan is trying to misuse every international forum to propagate half-truths and outright lies about Kashmir, it is heartwarming to hear friends raise their voice against this nefarious game plan. One such friend of India is the president of the Czech Republic, Mr. Vaclav Havel, who is at present visiting

this country. In no uncertain terms Mr. Havel has opposed the attempt to internationalize the Kashmir issue, thereby endorsing India's stand. Mr. Havel has asserted that the best way out is through peaceful bilateral negotiations as envisaged in the Shimla Agreement. Mr. Havel's stress on bilateral talks and peaceful negotiations stems from his abiding faith in the philosophy of Mahatma Gandhi, which revolves around the concept of nonviolence.

This is obviously not the case of those who would like to violate India's territorial integrity. Needless to add, the greatest threat on this front is today faced from Pakistan, which has been waging a low intensity proxy war in Kashmir for the past four years. How else does one explain the fact that even as Mr. Havel was prescribing bilateralism as the best option, Pakistan's representatives were busy trying to move a blatantly anti-India resolution at the ongoing UN Human Rights Conference in Geneva. Is Islamabad really interested in the welfare of the Kashmiri people, or is it more more bothered about embarrassing New Delhi? It would appear that it is the second point that interests Ms. Benazir Bhutto's government more than anything else. That is to harass India. For if India had anything to hide about the reality in Kashmir, it would not have allowed foreigners access to the valley. Over the past year more than a 100 foreign journalists and legislators have visited Kashmir. As recently as last Monday, four ambassadors to the European Commission representing the Netherlands, Greece, Belgium, and Germany were flown to Kashmir for an on-the-spot assessment of the situation.

Let there be no mistake about the purpose of sending a so-called fact-finding mission to Kashmir, which Pakistan has been pressing for time and again both in the UN and now at various human rights conferences. What Pakistan wants is a team of its own choice, preferably constituted by individuals who are favorably inclined toward promoting Islamabad's designs on Kashmir. Such a mission would serve the dual purpose of furthering the Pakistani cause and whitewashing Islamabad's nefarious game plan. It would no doubt try and suppress the fact that the Inter-Services Intelligence—ISI—has a finger in the Kashmir pie; that, had it not been for arms and material assistance from across the border, terrorism would not have flourished in the valley. Neither would such a team take note of the ISI training out-of-work Afghan mujahedin and then sending them into Kashmir to lend a helping hand to the separatists.

Given this backdrop, it is becoming increasingly imperative for India to mobilize international opinion against Pakistani designs on Kashmir. Thankfully, given India's record as a leading members of the Nonaligned Movement and its democratic credentials, not to mention the role the country has played in promoting the cause of the developing world—something which Pakistan can never boast of—there are numerous people who are willing to lend their voice against Islamabad's perception. For instance, last week the U.S. assistant secretary of state,

Miss Robin Raphel, who had audaciously suggested a couple of months ago that Kashmir's accession to India was not final and binding, was taken to task by two senators, Mr. Daniel Patrick Moynihan—a Democrat and a former ambassador to India—and Mr. Hank Brown—a Republican. They did not mince words in criticizing the U.S. Administration for its South Asia policy as reflected in comments and statements on the Kashmir issue. Mr. Moynihan will soon be visiting India and it is hoped that the impressions he will carry back will improve awareness of the reality as it exists in Kashmir.

*** Tension With Pakistan Over Kashmir Said Increasing**

*Calcutta ANANDA BAZAR PATRIKA in Bengali
10 Feb 94 p 4*

[Editorial: "Tensions Created Over Kashmir"]

[Excerpt] Indo-Pak relations are in a free-fall slide over the Kashmir problem. Mutual accusations and allegations followed by counter-allegations have filled the two neighbors with enmity toward one another. Pakistan is even more over-heated. A nation-wide strike is being observed to show solidarity with Kashmiri militants. This fruitless effort is like cutting off one's nose to spite one's face. In reaction, the Youth Congress [Indian Congress (I)] has held demonstrations. Demonstrations have been held near the Kashmir and Punjab borders [with Pakistan]. In both countries, these demonstrations have the possibility of flaring into violence and security forces may have to use force to contain these demonstrations. Mutual suspicions are escalating and could become explosive. When there is a halt in understanding between India and Pakistan, the increasing tensions in the Sub-continent become very worrisome.

Everyone knows the basic cause of the Kashmir crisis. After the separatists became involved in terrorism, the situation became more complex. It is no secret that these terrorists have received training, weapons and shelter from Pakistan. Pakistan wants all of Kashmir as its own. But Bhutto's intentions do not match those of the militants. Their dream is of an independent Kashmir. Consequently, Benazir's wishes are unlikely to be fulfilled. In reality, Kashmir is an inseparable part of India and its own internal affair. Benazir cannot take Kashmir by force. This is why she is so busy making a fuss about it everywhere. She is busy raising the subject at international forums and is not particular about where. For example, she tried to raise the Kashmir issue at an economic summit in Davos. It was farcical. People did not come to Davos to hear her lecture about Kashmir. She tried to present the Kashmir problem as an issue of concern to the entire Muslim world. Many Muslim countries, however, regard Kashmir as an internal matter of India.

Perhaps a more important point, though, is that the Muslim world is divided. Unlike the middle ages in

which jihads were conducted in the name of religion, national interests are now paramount. When Pakistan was created as an Islamic nation, half of India's Muslims remained behind. They accepted the secularist Indian Republic. The Islamic community in Pakistan has been unable to build national unity on the basis of Islam. Was not Bangladesh created on differences of language and culture? [passage omitted on separatist tendencies in Pakistan]

Now Pakistan is raising Kashmir in international forums. There are supporters in the U.S. administration. The Kashmir problem is complex. The common man's life is full of uncertainty due to terrorists clashing with security forces. There has been suffering on all sides. Internationalization, however, is not the solution. Making Kashmir an Islamic nation is not the solution. Benazir Bhutto, living in a glass house herself, should not throw stones.

*** Commentary Views Pakistani Occupied Kashmir**

*94AS0207A Calcutta THE STATESMAN in English
11, 12 Feb 94*

[Article in two parts by A.G. Noorani: "Why the POK"—quotation marks as published]

[11 Feb p 8]

[Part I]

[Text] On January 29, the JKLF [Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front] leader, Mr. Amanullah Khan, tartly reminded the Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mrs Benazir Bhutto, that Pakistan's persistent rejection of "the third option" of independence for Kashmir is "tantamount to denying them the very right of self-determination," a right which, he asserted, cannot be "limited, conditioned or circumscribed." But Pakistan's espousal of the right to self-determination has ever been self-servingly conditional and circumscribed. It is demanded of the part of Kashmir which, mercifully, escaped its occupation, albeit, not its repeated depredations. The right to self-determination is not recognized for Pakistan-Occupied Kashmir, miscalled "Azad" (free) Kashmir. Pakistan has banned the cry of plebiscite or independence in the POK [Pakistan Occupied Kashmir].

The Azad Jammu and Kashmir Interim Constitution Act, 1974, obliges all office-bearers from the President down and all legislators to swear loyalty "to the cause of accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir to Pakistan." Islam is made the State religion (Article 3). The President and the Prime Minister must be Muslim.

Plebiscite Plea

The fundamental right to freedom of association is restricted to forbid the cry of a free plebiscite. The POK bans political parties which advocate independence, let alone accession to India. Article 7(2) reads thus: "No person or political party in Azad Jammu and Kashmir

shall be permitted to propagate against, or take part in activities prejudicial or detrimental to, the ideology of the State's accession to Pakistan." In short, none can ask for a plebiscite as such in the POK. They can ask only for accession to Pakistan. Plebiscite is for the rest of the State.

This Constitution was imposed on the POK by the former Prime Minister, Mr. Z.A. Bhutto, after he had, in a speech at the POK capital Muzaffarabad on November 7, 1973, asked the people "not to aspire for an independent status" and offered them three choices—the status quo, a full-fledged province of Pakistan, or "provincial status"—as if the territory was Pakistan's to deal with as it pleased rather than one temporarily in "its occupation pending a solution to the Kashmir dispute. In Pakistan's perception, it is the rest of the State which is "disputed territory," not the part it has grabbed.

The POK's Constitution of 1974 was imposed on it. Its preamble recites that the Government of Pakistan "approved" the repeal of the 1970 Constitution "and authorized the President of Azad Jammu and Kashmir to introduce" the Constitution Bill "for consideration and passage." The document rivets the POK to Pakistan's constitutional and political system.

The POK's legal status and Pakistan's conduct in respect of it over the years are surely of crucial relevance in the quest for solutions to the Kashmir question. But the POK has ever been a dark and neglected area. Pakistan has adroitly focused attention on the rest of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, which it ardently covets. That fact should not deflect one from the duty to subject the Government of India's actions to scrutiny and criticism, especially the violation of human rights and political freedom. But Pakistan's conduct in the POK should receive the same treatment. It has not, however.

Pakistan resents such criticism. It resents intensely the expression Pak-Occupied Kashmir and uses blithely its coinage "Indian-Held Kashmir." If one were to take "the U.N. resolutions" by which it swears as common ground, one would find that while the legality of the accession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was consistently and explicitly accepted in those resolutions, the expression "Pak-Occupied Kashmir" is derived from those very documents.

They have a lineage in the proceedings of the Security Council at an early stage. The United States Representative, Mr. Warren Austin, said on February 4, 1948: "We must face the legal situation. The external sovereignty of Jammu and Kashmir is no longer under the control of the Maharaja ... with the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India, this foreign sovereignty went over to India and is exercised by India and that is how India happens to be here as a petitioner."

On January 20, 1948, the Security Council set up a three-member Commission. On April 21, 1948, the Council not only expanded its membership to five but

laid down the details of a plebiscitory solution. A Plebiscite Administrator was to be nominated by the U.N. Secretary-General. Para 10(b) said: "The Plebiscite Administrator, acting as an officer of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, should have authority to nominate his assistants—and to draft regulations governing the plebiscite. Such nominees should be formally appointed and such draft regulations should be formally promulgated by the State of Jammu and Kashmir."

Recognition

This is an explicit recognition by the UN of: (a) the legality of Kashmir's accession to India; (b) India's external sovereignty over the State; and (c) the legal authority of the Government of the State. Hence, the formal induction of the Plebiscite Administrator by the State Government, although he was to be nominated by the UN Secretary-General.

The UN Commission for India and Pakistan, acting under this mandate, arrived in the subcontinent in July, 1948. At the outset, on August 5, 1948, its members agreed that it should avoid any action which might be interpreted as signifying *de facto* or *de jure* recognition of the "Azad Kashmir Government." On August 13, 1948, the UNCIP [UN Commission for India and Pakistan] adopted a resolution embodying its proposals for a settlement. India accepted it. Pakistan did not.

On December 11, 1948, the UNCIP offered proposals in amplification of the first to provide for a plebiscite. Both sides accepted it. They were formally embodied in its resolution of January 5, 1949, the parties having declared a ceasefire on New Year's Day. As Ms. Krishna Menon said in the Security Council on February 8, 1957, "the only international engagements that exist are two resolutions of the UNCIP dated August 13, 1948, and January 5, 1949. These are the engagements. If they were of a formal character, they might be treaties..."

Legal Status

The UNCIP had published in November, 1948, in its first interim report, the minutes of its talks with both sides. They were thus fully aware of the UNCIP's clarifications before they accepted its second resolution. It is the August 13, 1948, resolution which defined the legal status of the authorities in the POK. It provided first for a ceasefire; next, a truce agreement laying down details of troop withdrawals on both sides; and finally determination of the future status of Kashmir "in accordance with the will of the people." The word plebiscite was not used. That was done in the second resolution.

While the tribesmen from Pakistan and Pakistan's troops were to be withdrawn completely, India was to withdraw only "the bulk of its forces," retaining some "to assist local authorities in the observance of law and order." That was not the only asymmetry. The existence of the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir was explicitly recognized and so, indeed, was the State's

accession to India and assumption of "external sovereignty." Accordingly, the resolution provided that "the Government of India will undertake to ensure that the Government of the State of Jammu and Kashmir" will safeguard law and order "and that human and political rights will be respected."

For the other part of the State, the resolution said: "Pending a final solution, the territory evacuated by the Pakistani troops will be administered by the local authorities under the surveillance of the Commission." This, the only provision for that area, is in contrast to the clear recognition of the State Government, acting under the Government of India in respect of external relations. No surveillance was provided for this part of the State.

[12 Feb p 8]

[Part II]

[Text] The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Sir Muhammad Zafrullah Khan, had an important meeting with the UNCIP on September 2, 1948. Its minutes have not been published. But Sardar Mohammed Ibrahim Khan, the founder-President of the "Azad Kashmir" Government, published in his informative book "The Kashmir Saga" some revealing extracts. They show that Sir Zafrullah was clearly told: "By 'local authorities' we mean the Azad Kashmir people though we cannot grant recognition to the Azad Kashmir Government."

These authorities "will be responsible for the maintenance of law and order and security"—only. More explicitly, "we cannot lose sight of the fact that the State of Jammu and Kashmir still exists as a legal entity. *We have to respect its sovereignty.*" Sir Zafrullah himself had told the Commission earlier that "even his own Government had not granted legal recognition for the Azad 'Government' in view of the implications which might ensue."

Puppet

Not long after, Pakistan recognized this puppet "Government." A new regime was imposed on the POK on June 21, 1952. Rules of Business were prescribed on October 28, Rule 5 said: "The President of Azad Kashmir Government shall hold office during the pleasure of the All Jammu and Kashmir Muslim Conference duly recognized as such by the Government of Pakistan in the Ministry of Kashmir Affairs." The Ministry's Joint Secretary could attend meetings of the Council of Ministers and "tender advice on any matter under discussion." What, one must ask, are the legal "implications" of such a set-up in the POK, which has existed for over four decades in flagrant breach of the UNCIP's resolution?

On August 17, 1948, Prime Minister Nehru asked the UNCIP about the import of the reference to "the local authorities" in the POK. He was told, the minutes record, that "the phrase *pending a final solution* was intended to recognize the temporary nature of the

administration by local authorities. *Sovereignty over the territory was not to be changed.*" This clearly meant sovereignty of the State Government over the POK. For, it was in answer to Nehru's pointed query whether the UNCIP "envisaged any change in the status of the territory or whether it recognized the jurisdiction of the Government of Jammu and Kashmir over that territory." Equally explicit assurances were given in subsequent talks.

This brings us to the nomenclature which raises the hackles of our Pakistani friends—the POK. The UNCIP resolution of August 13, 1948, spoke of "the territory evacuated by the Pakistani troops." Since the evacuation has not yet taken place, is it unfair to call it Pak-Occupied Kashmir? Especially since the UNCIP clarified to Sir Zafrullah on September 3, 1948, that "the term *evacuated territory* refers to those territories in the State of Jammu and Kashmir which are at present under the effective control of the Pakistan High Command."

This is the nub of the matter. The legal sovereignty of the State of Jammu and Kashmir over "those territories" was recognized. So, also, the *de facto* position that they were "under the effective control" of the Pakistani Army. There is not much to choose between PCK (Pak-Controlled Kashmir) and POK (Pak-Occupied Kashmir).

There is, however, a graver aspect, besides. Nehru wrote to the UNCIP on August 20, 1948, that its resolution of August 13, "should not be interpreted, or applied in practice, so as: (a) to bring into question the sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir Government over the portion of their territory evacuated by Pakistani troops; (b) to afford any recognition of the so-called 'Azad Kashmir Government'; or (c) to enable this territory to be consolidated in any way during the period of truce to the disadvantage of the State." On August 25, the UNCIP assured Nehru that his interpretation "coincides with its own interpretation."

These assurances were known to Pakistan when it accepted "the plebiscite resolution" of January 5, 1949. It provided that the Plebiscite Administrator "will be formally appointed to office by the Government of Jammu and Kashmir." He "shall derive from the State of Jammu and Kashmir" the requisite powers and shall report the result of the plebiscite not only to the UNCIP but also "to the Government of Jammu and Kashmir."

In this, the UNCIP acted with perfect legal propriety. The legality of the State's accession to India was incontestable. That did not preclude a plebiscite, however. But among the prime causes which have rendered a plebiscite impossible is, surely, Pakistan's annexation of the POK and its policies towards the rest of the State. The war of 1965, for instance. It sought to grab it at its chosen forum, the battlefield, and failed.

Aggression

It seeks the same result today by a low-cost, covert operation. The POK has served as a launching pad for this aggression. It is firmly riveted to Pakistan's control through the Azad J & K Council, set up by S. 21 of the Act of 1974. It is presided over by the Prime Minister of Pakistan and comprises his five nominees, the President and Prime Minister of the POK and six representatives of the POK Assembly, elected by proportional representation.

Political developments faithfully mirror those in Pakistan—Basic Democracy of Ayub Khan, Zia's Martial Law, and the rest. In December, 1993, the blasphemy laws of Pakistan were extended to the POK. The northern areas of the State have been dismembered from the POK and their status as part of the State questioned, inviting a stinging rebuff from the POK's High Court on March 8, 1993. They are ruled directly through a Chief Executive, Lt-Gen. Mohammad Shafiq, appointed by Islamabad, with a 26-member Northern Areas Council. The people have never seen elections or enjoyed political or human rights.

The POK is better only in form. In 1990 the Pakistan People's Party came to power. In 1991, after Mrs Bhutto's dismissal, elections were held again which all outside the ruling party in Islamabad called "foul." The POK's Premier, Mr. M.H. Rathore, rejected the results and announced a fresh poll. On July 5, 1991, he was sacked by Islamabad, arrested after a Federal Minister and a Brigadier in the Army had inveigled him out of his residence on the pretext that the Army Chief wished to meet him. He was flown to Islamabad, put in a guest house, and beaten up.

Self-Interest

Let us go back to the basics. Why did Pakistan's troops enter Kashmir at all "early in May, 1948?" Purely in self-interest. The information was given belatedly to the UNCIP on July 8, 1948—not to the Security Council at all. A memo by Pakistan to the UNCIP on August 19, 1948, set out the reasons candidly. It was a perceived "threat to Pakistan's security" posed by Indian military operations against the tribesmen. "It was this which compelled the Government of Pakistan to move their troops into certain defensive positions." There they remain stay put to this day, occupying areas of the State in breach of the UNCIP's resolutions and of Pakistan's own assurances to it. In contrast to the Government in Srinagar, the regime in Muzaffarabad is one set up by Pakistan in territory it has occupied, not acquired by law.

None of this minimizes the need to resolve the vexed problem of Kashmir "in accordance with the will of the people," as the 1948 resolution put it. But the contours of a solution in 1994 will necessarily be different from those that were envisaged in 1948-49 given Pakistan's concept of selective self-determination. Neither plebiscite nor independence can now be contemplated. It is

not beyond the wit of man to devise a solution which satisfies the aspirations of the people within the Indian Union, redresses the grave wrongs they have suffered, and also provides for the legitimate interests of Pakistan and of the POK.

*** U.S. Comparison of Kashmir, Afghanistan Criticized**

94AS0206B Bangalore DECCAN HERALD in English
12 Feb 94 p 1

[Excerpt] New Delhi, Feb 11—India today firmly rejected a recent reference by the United States to the situation in Kashmir, comparing it to the situation in Afghanistan and asserted that such references betrayed the "lack of balance and proper perspective" on the part of U.S. officials which was tantamount to providing "encouragement to Pakistan and terrorists sustained by them to continue with their violent activities."

Noting that the remarks recently made in Washington by the U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for South Asian Affairs, Ms. Robin Raphel, a spokesman of the Ministry of External Affairs today said the comparison was grossly misplaced as the Afghan situation was a by-product of the Cold War whereas Jammu and Kashmir has been facing a massive campaign of terrorism aided and abetted by Pakistan. The only link between the two was that the weapons and mercenaries were moved from both Afghanistan and Pakistan to foment trouble in Kashmir, the spokesman said. [passage omitted]

*** Peoples League Party Leader Fears Disintegration**

94AS0206D Bangalore DECCAN HERALD in English
12 Feb 94 p 7

[Text] Jammu, Feb 11—Top Kashmiri secessionist leader Shabir Ahmed Shah has warned that India and Pakistan could meet the same fate which befell the Soviet Union if they do not seek a negotiated settlement to the 46-year-old Kashmir imbroglio in harmony with the people of Kashmir.

"Soviet Union was a superpower and India and Pakistan are just developing countries—no match for erstwhile Soviet Union even as India mistakenly claims to be a superpower," he told newsmen after he came out of a special court in Jammu trying cases under the Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act (Tada).

The Kashmiri leader, recognised as a prisoner of conscience who had spent a total of 21 years in jail, recalled telling India: "We have not (sic) enmity with Indians but we are opposed (sic) usurpation of Kashmir by Indian Government."

Shah, who heads the powerful Peoples League Party of Kashmir, said the present armed movement would continue until India "honestly" came forward for talks with the Kashmiris and Pakistan to solve the dispute in accordance with the wishes of the Kashmiris. "We are even prepared for talks and invite all parties to the

dispute namely Kashmirs, India and Pakistan besides international observers and some friendly countries (to) settle the problem."

Earlier, at the first hearing of the Tada case filed against him by the State Government, Shah, in a statement presented to the court, denied the charge made when he was arrested in 1989 that he was going to Pakistan, and that Pakistani currency notes had been recovered from him.

He said he wanted the implementation of a UN resolution on Kashmir, which he said Hari Singh, the former Kashmir Maharaja, and Nehru, too, had accepted.

Asked whether he stood by two options of India and Pakistan declared in the UN resolution, he said ultimately the people of Kashmir had to decide, and if they wanted "independence nobody can prevent them."

Shah spoke of the destruction caused in Kashmir in the past four years and said: "Hundreds of people were killed and hundreds of women were molested as hundreds of human settlements were destroyed." "Thousands of people had been arrested and many of them (were) subjected to torture at interrogation centres."

Shah said the accession to India was "illegitimate and unlawful," arguing: "If saying so is a crime (I am) prepared (to) confess my guilt."

Outside the court, Shah's 75-year-old mother told newsmen that she was proud of her son. "He is a great *mujahid* (freedom fighter) and even if he is hanged (I) will have no regrets because he has been fighting for the cause for last 21 years."

Meanwhile, an official spokesman said four militants, including a self-styled company commander of the pro-Pakistan Hizbul-Mujahidin, were killed in two separate encounters with security forces during search operations in Baramulla district last evening. A militant was apprehended and four AK 47 rifles, five magazines and 30 rounds were recovered during the searches.

The spokesman said security forces averted a major disaster when they detected and defused three powerful improvised explosive devices (IED) and an anti-personnel mine at Anantnag last night. Some unidentified gunmen shot at and seriously wounded a person at Alichabag in the district.

The spokesman said security forces apprehended six militants during search operations and recovered a large quantity of arms and ammunition in the Valley during the past 24 hours.

Pakistan-trained militants fired four rockets fitted with mines in the Manjakote area of Rajouri district last evening. Two rockets exploded at a deserted place without causing any damage, while two others did not explode and were recovered by security forces during searches, official sources said.

The said earlier militants and Pakistani troops had fired several rockets fitted with time bombs in Poonch and Rajouri districts during last month. This is the first time the rockets were fitted with mines.

*** Pakistan Said Using Kashmir to Aggravate Tensions Nationwide**

94AS0211C New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 12 Feb 94 pp 1, 12

[Article by Rambahadur Ray: "Pakistan Intends to Spread Religious and Communal Violence in India"]

[Text] New Delhi, 11 February—A regular task force is working in Pakistan since 1990 for operation K-2 to spread religious and ethnic violence in India. This task force was composed of Brigadier Mohammed Salim, Brigadier Javed, and Major Haider. A special research council is assisting this task force. It is composed of high military and ISI [Inter-Services Intelligence of Pakistan] officers. It decides how to provide aid to various active groups in India. The Indian Government has not yet made any plans to foil the Pakistani conspiracy. It is wasting time in other, unnecessary efforts.

Pakistan's Operation K-2 is a decisive effort. It was launched in order to acquire Kashmir. The main battle under it is being fought in Kashmir. In order to strengthen their position, small groups are being incited to spread separatism and violence throughout the country. The Indian Government is aware that Major Haider has been managing this front in the Kashmir Valley since 1991. After establishing his control over all Kashmiri groups, Major Haider entered the valley. This is an example of fighting against India right on its soil. He is working closely with terrorist organizations.

A U. S. Congress committee report has details of this operation. In December 1991, Major Haider called a meeting of representatives of Ikhvanul Musalmin, the Allah Tigers, Hizbul, and mujaheddin organizations. The decision to start a combined campaign was made in this meeting. This also affected the other, smaller organizations. At present, about 150 organizations are active there. This has helped the religious terrorists come under one umbrella. In response, the ISI increased its aid to them. In light of the activities of 1991, Major Haider went to the Kashmir valley to supervise this campaign. We can understand this because of the terrible fighting that occurred at that time. This was a very difficult period for Indian security forces. Prime Minister P. V. Narasimha Rao has repeatedly said that Pakistan is fighting a shadow war in Kashmir. This is only half true. It is not a shadow war anymore, now that Major Haider has arrived there. During that period, the Kashmiri terrorists fought the security forces face to face. This is a great achievement for any terrorist group, and it is still going on in the Kashmir Valley.

The next year, in the summer of 1992, a large number of Pakistani-trained terrorists entered Kashmir. According to one estimate, they had 20,000 AK-47 and AK-56

rifles. During those days, the terrorists attacked security forces on a daily basis. The ones that were killed in these skirmishes included, in addition to trained terrorists, the Afghan mujaheddin. According to one estimate, between 1990 and 1992, 20,000 Kashmiri youths received training across the border. Brigadier Mohammed Salim led this training effort. These training camps were operated as a joint project of the ISI and the army. There are 15 permanent training camps in Azad Kashmir, the portion of Kashmir that is controlled by Pakistan. There are an additional 30 temporary camps. These new training centers were built for religious terrorists in 1992. Brigadier Javed was made their director. He had all kinds of experiences, through the CIA, in working for the ISI and the mujaheddin during the Afghan War.

Training camps were opened for religious terrorists in Gohad, Larkana, Sangli, Sargodha, Cuttock, Murree, Sialkot, and Lahore. One of these camps was operated with Iran's help. The suicide brigades were trained there. After that, in addition to Kashmir, efforts to spread terrorism across different parts of India were accelerated. Now they have opened centers in many places. The bomb blast on Palam Airport on 25 June 1991 attracted attention to these agencies. A bomb was found in an Air India plane on 1 December 1991. That plane was leaving New Delhi for London. The Janbaz Force took responsibility for it. After that, there were bomb blasts in Delhi and many other cities. In August 1992, two Pakistanis were arrested 30 kilometers from Madras. They were trying to blow up a train. Police agencies have collected a lot of evidence from these groups. Pakistani agents were also involved in blowing up the RSS (Rashtriya Swayamsevak Sangh) office in Madras. They were conspiring to transform the religious tension there into a lava of violence.

Who is helping the Pakistani agents? The Indian Government is in the dark about this. The little information that has been collected mentions SIMI (Student Islamic Movement of India) repeatedly. According to the U. S. Congress committee report, the religious terrorists trust this group. The central investigation bureau learned about a terrorist named Surjeet while investigating Dr. Jalis Ansari. It was learned that he was working with Abdullah Shiragi. Abdullah Shiragi is a well-known Kashmiri terrorist. He attended the SIMI conference in 1991.

The Kashmiri active organization, Jamaat-i Tulba, was given the duty of sending its members to accept asylum in various parts of India. Its agents have taken different routes to go to India and Nepal. Jamal Alvi of Lucknow was their special agent. He was working for Dr. Jalis Ansari and Hilal Beg. Dr. Habib of Raibareilly is also considered a member of this group.

The central and state governments' intelligence agencies could not understand the network that Jamaat-i Tulba had spread. The government is not sure how much it hurt the Pakistani conspiracy in its recent arrests. The only estimates it could make from these arrests were

related to what kind of tricks Pakistan was using in the war on Kashmir. It appears to be establishing small groups in different places that can be activated at its instruction when the time comes. After the Bombay blasts, the government was wrong to consider that the Memon group was operating alone. That group had finished, to an extent. The recent arrests has created only the scene of the "seed of blood." The Indian Government will not be able to totally destroy it with its weak efforts.

Before the last Independence Day, General K. V. Krishan Rao, the Jammu-Kashmir governor, admitted that Pakistan was planning to infiltrate India with a large number of soldiers. He reported that 10,000 Afghan mercenary soldiers were ready for it. This statement is also supported by a U. S. Congress committee report. According to the report, Pakistan has been using Afghan mercenary soldiers in Kashmir since 1992. During the summer of that year, 200 mercenary soldiers were working with the terrorists, and another 300 mercenary soldiers have been waiting since 1992. Last summer, 200 mercenary soldiers were sent into Kashmir. According to this report, the Kashmiri terrorists informed that 300 additional Afghan mercenary soldiers were waiting to enter since 1992. It is clear now that when CIA Director Robert Gates came to India in 1990, he pressured the Pakistani president to close the bases in Lahore.

*** U.S. Said To View Kashmir Crisis as Basis for Intervention**

94AS02121 Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English
14 Feb 94 p 8

[Article by Nikhil Chakravarty: "Winner in the Round-Robin"]

[Text] Once again Ms. Robin Raphel has attacked the government of India. Though a state department underling she, it is said, has a lot of clout in the United States administration because she is supposed to be close to the U.S. president, Mr. Bill Clinton.

Last October, Ms. Raphel had attacked the Indian position on Kashmir by saying the U.S. administration did not take as final the state's accession to the Indian Union. That time Ms. Raphel's revelation had come as part of a background briefing to the media. In four months, she has come back to the very same theme of Kashmir, saying that it is as bad as Afghanistan. But this time it was a public speech at the Asia Society's Washington branch. Ms. Raphel went further to warn that Kashmir, like Afghanistan, has "the potential to mutate into wider regional conflicts."

This bombshell from the head of the South Asia bureau of the state department was unexpected for U.S. watchers in India. In fact, most of them had tried to dismiss Ms. Raphel's earlier statement questioning Kashmir's accession to India as the outburst of an individual in the U.S. government and not the latter's considered view. Explanations were even sought and received from official

quarters in Washington. It was given out that Ms. Raphael did not represent the official U.S. viewpoint.

This time no such alibi can be forthcoming since the lady herself has been quoted as saying whatever she had said was backed by the "full authority" of Mr. Clinton. She added that all her remarks reflected the U.S. administration's policy and were not personal observations.

A careful analysis of the present state of the U.S. government's attitude to India makes it abundantly clear what Ms. Raphael said both now and earlier could not possibly be dismissed as the impudent remarks of a U.S. official airing her personal opinion and thereby breaking protocol. In a sense, Ms. Raphael has done India a good turn by leaving very little scope for any illusions about the U.S. administration's attitude to India.

Some in India feel the U.S. approach towards India has radically changed for the better. They argue old prejudices about India as a camp follower of Moscow no longer exist since the Soviet Union itself has disappeared and the world has emerged out of the superpower rivalry of the Cold War years. This argument is buttressed by the theory that since India has scrapped the Nehruvian model of development, is willing to toe the World Bank's free market line on the economic front and has invited multi-nationals to invest in the country, the United States has come to regard it not only as a good friend but as a virtual camp follower.

Not only on the economic front but in defence as well, Washington must have—or should have—noticed New Delhi's readiness to comply with its injunctions. This was evident by the fact Indian military authorities extended their cooperation to the U.S. Pacific command, and then, more pointedly, agreed to send forces to Somalia as desired by Washington.

The expected results turned out rather discomfiting for this pro-U.S. lobby in India. Mr. Clinton's speech on Kashmir before the United Nations general assembly last year made it abundantly clear he saw the situation in the state as a civil war. Over the last two months, he has demonstrated which way he leans by responding with a touch of affectionate sympathy to a letter from one of the militant organisations in Kashmir demanding secession from India. As if this were not enough, he has sympathised with a Khalistani outfit as well.

Mr. John Mallot to Ms. Robin Raphael with Mr. Clinton's rather unorthodox interjections in between—it is clear Washington is hardly reconciled to New Delhi's stand that Kashmir is part of India. While a number of Western governments have in recent times expressed their misgivings at the violation of human rights in Kashmir, none has questioned the validity of Kashmir being part of India.

When Mr. Clinton in his address before the UN general assembly referred to Kashmir as having a civil war situation, he implied the legitimacy of the Indian government's authority over Kashmir was in question. If it

was only a case of human rights violations on the part of the Indian security forces, then one does not have to use the term civil war. The concept of civil war itself implies that rival forces are contending for state power. In other words, the two sides, namely the Indian security forces and the armed militants, are to be looked at as being on par in their respective claims to state power.

In this context, Ms. Raphael's October observation sought to provide a historical justification for the U.S. official position, that is, Kashmir's accession to the Indian Union itself could not be regarded as final and irrevocable. Her latest remark that Kashmir is in the same category as Afghanistan is all the more ominous.

What is the situation in Afghanistan today? It is admitted by all that there is no state authority in that country, torn as it is between rival factions fighting one another to extend their respective domains by sheer use of force. There is no central authority in Afghanistan. It cannot even be said that he who controls Kabul rules the country. The three contending leaders—Mr. Abdul Rashid Dostum, Mr. Ahmad Shah Mas'ud and Mr. Golboddin Hekmatyar—are all equally matched and none can claim to be superior to the other.

When someone in all seriousness compares Kashmir with the Afghan situation, it is clearly a case of inciting the Kashmiri militants against the authority of the government of India. It is an announcement the Indian government is as effete as President Borhanoddin Rabbani, and no superior than Messrs Hekmatyar, Dostum and Mas'ud.

Washington's position has thus moved very far from expressions of concern at the violation of human rights. It is often pleaded by the U.S. administration and its cohorts that what really bothers Washington about the present unrest in Kashmir is that it might spark off a full scale war between India and Pakistan. In this war, it fears, both countries might at some stage be desperate enough to use nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons, the U.S. authorities are convinced, both India and Pakistan possess or are capable of producing at short notice. So the real U.S. concern, it is argued, is the danger of a nuclear war breaking out in south Asia, particularly when both countries have not signed the nuclear non-proliferation treaty.

But the Indian perception is that the nuclear war danger is being used as an excuse for U.S. intervention in the world after the Cold War. The United States tries to justify its persistent inroads into Iraq's sovereignty by saying Mr. Saddam Husayn might build the nuclear bomb. This is taken as an example of the U.S. cooking up an alibi for direct intervention—next time in the affairs of south Asia with the Kashmir crisis being played up beyond recognition.

It is time New Delhi woke up to these new realities. To expect that the Clinton administration will pull up Pakistan and thereby ensure arms supply to Kashmiri

militants is stopped is to misread the U.S. objective in Kashmir. The U.S. has in fact no interest in curbing militant secessionism in the valley. It needs to be stressed that both Ms. Raphael's and Mr. Clinton's pronouncements must have acted as a tonic to the Kashmiri militants.

New Delhi's campaign last year beseeching the U.S. administration to declare Pakistan a terrorist state was unrealistic. For those in the Indian government who tried to do so, the U.S. official pronouncements must have come as a shock from which they will take a long time to recover. One can guess from their pathetic position how unreal it would be to expect the prime minister, Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, to pay an official visit to Washington, which is what some of his officials have been trying hard to arrange this summer.

* Gill Ready With Strategy for Kashmir

94AS0206G Hyderabad DECCAN CHRONICLE
in English 14 Feb 94 p 1

[Excerpts of interview with K.P. Singh Gill, director general of Punjab police, by R. Balaji; place and date not given—quotation marks as published—first three paragraphs DECCAN CHRONICLE introduction]

[Text] Hyderabad, Jan 13—He does not betray the image of being the 'super cop' of the country. Obviously delighted with the resounding success he and his men had against the terrorists in Punjab, Mr. K.P. Singh Gill, the Director-General of the Punjab police, feels that, if Punjab can be freed from the stranglehold of terrorists, there is no reason why the volatile Jammu and Kashmir cannot [be] freed from the trigger-happy ultras.

And given Mr. Gill's determination and the way in which he paid the Punjab terrorists in their own coin, Kashmir can certainly become once again a peaceful and prosperous State that it was a decade back. Will he go to Kashmir to counter the terrorists? "Yes, if the government wants me," says Mr. Gill like a true soldier.

Mr. Gill, who is now on a visit to the city, spoke to DECCAN CHRONICLE at length on the way he dealt with the militants in his State.

Excerpts from the interview.

What priorities did you have in mind when you worked out a strategy for Punjab?

The top priority was to beat the terrorists at their own game. Develop the expertise to meet them face to face, match their firepower, strategy and ultimately it was a man to man fight. When we changed our strategy and also improved our weaponry and intelligence network, we were always ahead of them and able to put them down.

Did your strategy go as per the plan?

We kept two things in mind. First we knew we had to react to their moves and counter it. Then we wanted to

try and find out about their recruits and prevent the same. We also countered their propaganda and tried to cut their roots, destroy their bases and indulge in day and night combing operations.

Was there any change in the strategy adopted by your predecessor, Mr. J.F. Riberio, and you?

My strategy was part of an extension of the strategy adopted by Mr. Riberio. We extended upon the 25 percent success achieved by him.

What is the estimated member of terrorists remaining in the State?

There are no active terrorists now. Once in a while they come from other places and indulge in some acts and escape. But now we are very alert and preventing them from coming in.

Do you think the police alone was responsible for the success or is it because of better coordination with other agencies?

Oh yes! We had very good cooperation from the Army, BSF [Border Security Force], CRPF [Central Reserve Police Force] and others which contributed to the success.

What is the role of Pakistan in promoting subversive activities in Punjab?

Pakistan is very much involved in encouraging terrorist activities in the State. The recent arrest of Dr Sohan Singh revealed that at least eight important leaders of different groups are operating from Pakistan.

Is there a difference of opinion between you and the Chief Minister, Mr. Beant Singh?

No there is no differences between me and the Chief Minister.

Since the focus on terrorist violence has shifted from Punjab to Kashmir and in view of your own success in Punjab, would you prefer to take an assignment in Kashmir?

Yes ... for some time there was such a talk. If the government wants my services for Kashmir, I am ready for it. And I will go there if they want me.

Are you confident of achieving success in Kashmir too?

Well, one does not go to a place to fail in the mission. One goes to the place wanting to achieve success.

What strategy do you envisage for tackling the militants in Kashmir?

Sitting at a distant place (Punjab) one cannot work out any strategy. You have to be there to take a decision.

After your term, would you be interested in joining politics?

I have no intention of joining politics.

*** //Farooq's Formula Decried as Useless**

94AS0196B Varanasi AJ in Hindi 15 Feb 94 p 6

[Text] Dr. Farooq Abdullah, former chief minister of Jammu and Kashmir and the National Conference leader, has become too active in the valley affairs after his return from London. He is making some meaningless statements to support his selfish political interests which might aggravate the situation. Farooq recently said in an interview given in Geneva, where he had gone as the Indian representative to the 50th conference of the UN Human Rights Commission, that the central government should soon prepare a formula to resolve the Kashmir issue. This formula should include plans to return to the pre-1953 position given to Kashmir under to the Indian Constitution. He had indirectly supported giving autonomy to Jammu-Kashmir by this statement. Farooq wants the valley to get its former constitutional position so that he could become its leader and call himself the prime minister instead of the chief minister, establish a separate election commission, and negotiate a new definition of the valley with the Center. We can praise Dr. Abdullah's interview given in Geneva for strongly criticizing Pakistan for interfering in India's internal affairs, however, we cannot agree with his suggestion to announce a special package giving Kashmir its former constitutional position.

Autonomy or a special package for Jammu-Kashmir cannot guarantee solving the problems in the very sensitive and riot-torn state. This could raise questions about unity in this region because the problems there have been created by Pakistan deliberately. New conspiracies are implemented every day to spread anarchy, and it is not possible for Farooq Abdullah to be unaware of it all. He has isolated himself by issuing this statement in Geneva. He is neither the authorized spokesman for Jammu-Kashmir nor can he be considered the only representative of the Jammu-Kashmir people. Who will make the decision to prepare a special plan for the valley under this situation? It is useless to think about a special package when there is no elected government in the state. It is a good thing that the central government did not take Farooq Abdullah's statement seriously and Home Minister Chavan has refused to issue any kind of special package before the election in Kashmir. Farooq said that he was not afraid of the threats issued by the terrorists in the valley and that his suggestion, if the government decides to accept it, could help people there to learn about their rights and to establish peace in the valley. His ideas show his superficial mentality and reeks of political vested interests.

The most important step to establish peace in Kashmir and start the political process there is to put an end of the Pakistan-supported terrorist activities. The naive youth in the valley must be made aware of Pakistan's unholy

designs and be made to understand that their interests would be protected only if they remain with their own country and help maintain peace. Pakistan and its intelligence agency, ISI, are pulling all kind of stunts to make sure peace is not established in the valley. Its rulers are trying to condemn India by raising the Kashmir issue at the international level, and its intelligence agency ISI is sending trained terrorists to create unrest in Kashmir. India, after a long time, has accelerated diplomatic efforts and started a strong campaign to silence Pakistan. Similar alertness and swiftness is needed at the border so that Pakistan is forced to give up its declared policy of spreading unrest in Kashmir. Only then can the situation in the valley be normal and the atmosphere be made conducive to starting a political process. The Farooq formula can create new problems in the present situation and also will provide encouragement to Pakistan. Therefore, it should not be discussed at all.

*** Amnesty Allowed Into Kashmir, Russian Support Claimed**

94AS0196A Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES in Hindi 15 Feb 94 pp 1, 9

[Text] New Delhi, 14 February (Press Trust)—Minister of External Affairs Dinesh Singh informed today that Amnesty International will be permitted to visit Kashmir on a point-by-point basis.

The foreign minister was addressing the parliamentary advisory committee. He said that he was forming a transparent policy on Kashmir. He said that the government had given permission to some members of the International Committee of the Red Cross and a group of ambassadors from four European nations to visit Kashmir. These members visited several parts of Kashmir valley last week and reviewed the situation there.

Mr. Dinesh Singh said that this step will help counter the accusations of human rights violations in Kashmir being made at Pakistan's behest at the international level. He said that there is the danger that separatist and terrorist organizations might stage some drama for the benefit of foreign guests and communication media, however, the government will continue this transparent policy.

Several members in the meeting suggested that an Indian deputation should try to aggressively stop Pakistan's propaganda in the UN Human Rights Commission meeting.

Messrs Jagjit Singh, Umrao Singh, L.B. Rawal, B.B. Dutt, T.N. Chaturvedi, Ram Jethmalani, Chit Basu, Sharad Didhe, and G.G. Sawel were some of the prominent members present in the meeting.

India has meanwhile advised the United States as a friend of Pakistan to prepare Islamabad for bilateral talks with Delhi over various issues including Kashmir.

Prime Minister Narasimha Rao told Senator Patrick Moynihan (D) here today that it is imperative that Pakistan is made to understand that it is useless to raise the Kashmir issue at various levels. These actions are increasing tension and wasting time.

Mr. Rao said that India was following all the diplomatic protocols while Pakistan was doing exactly the opposite.

Mr. Moynihan during his visit with Home Minister Shankar Rao Chavan said that the Shimla agreement is a major support for improving Indo-Pakistan relations. He said that there has been no change in the U.S. policy on Kashmir.

A senior official in the Russian foreign office said in Moscow today that internationalization of the Kashmir issue will not help resolve this issue. This problem should be resolved by India and Pakistan by working together.

Mr. B.M. Yegorov, the chief of South Asian Bureau of the Russian foreign office emphasized in an interview today that the Kashmir problem was between India and Pakistan and it should be resolved peacefully. Mr. Yegorov said that the Shimla agreement can be used as a basis by India and Pakistan for resolving the Kashmir issue.

These comments by the senior Russian diplomat are very important against the background of Pakistan's recent campaign to make Kashmir an international issue.

Mr. Yegorov forcefully said that Russia always had the same stand on Kashmir and it does not see any reason to change this stand.

He said that there are two aspects of the Kashmir problem—political and human rights. However, these two should not be mixed.

*** Return to Normalcy Urged in Kashmir**

94AS0211D New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 16 Feb 94
p 4

[Article by Said Naqvi: "Delhi's Brave Start to Putting Srinagar Back on the Path to Governance"]

[Text] The human rights drama being staged in Geneva will complete its run by the second week of March. The focus of everyone's attention, however, will be the steps Prime Minister Narasimha Rao will take regarding the situation in Kashmir. The developments related to New Delhi and Srinagar will take place under his personal supervision.

Skeptical people will ask, "How do you know?" After all, there was never so much unawareness as there is now in the capital of what the prime minister wants. I can say, referring to a very reliable source, that one month ago, the prime minister had taken all of the Kashmir-related issues into his own hands.

The people who had been associated with Kashmir's administration until now are amused by the prime minister's direct interest in it. They argue that General Krishan Rao, Kashmir's governor, talks directly only with the prime minister. He does not even have time to talk with Home Minister Chavan or the Home Minister for State, Rajesh Pilot. The fact is that if either of them had any clout, he would have already been removed from the position of governor. After that, they would have been busy trying to push each other out and, following the Lucknow etiquette, asked one another to go first. By taking the Kashmir affair into his own hands, he has cleared up the rumor that he was removing the governor from his position.

The governor is still there. The people in the North Block who had bombarded the governor with accusations have pointed their cannons toward the governor's assistant now that the situation has changed. The balls of accusation are aimed at Sheikh Ghulam Rasul, the chief secretary of Jammu-Kashmir affairs. He is accused of being like a strange courtier who first won the governor's confidence with his cunning and then tried to dethrone him. The argument is that the chief secretary does not allow the governor to do what he wants to do. The list of accusations continues, and there are about 80 government employees who do not even go to work but still draw their salaries every month, thanks to the chief secretary. There are quite a few employees of the Jammu-Kashmir police who are working in cahoots with the terrorists. Until they are controlled, the Central Reserve Police and the Border Security Force cannot work closely with the local police, because the fear is that all their plans are forwarded to the terrorists.

After the peaceful resolution of the Hazratbal crisis, there were indications that the Kashmiri people wanted a normal situation in the valley. The administration there, however, was not the kind which respected their wishes and followed up on them. No attention was paid to accounts for four years. Now the chief secretary is being blamed for part of this poor administration, breaking various rules and regulations (which used to be blamed on the governor before), and hindering the government's work.

The situation [here described] in Kashmir is not based on my own observations. I have not visited the valley for some time. I have based my conclusion on what I have heard from the politicians and officials who have visited Kashmir.

How will the prime minister proceed with this affair? He will talk with the governor and announce that it is very important that Sheikh Ghulam Rasul remain in his present position. The intelligence bureau report will be presented in detail. Until the chief secretary is removed, the terrorism in the valley will not end.

At one point, it was a common belief that the British and the Americans believed that Pakistani assistance to Kashmiri terrorists had started to come from across the

border. Siddhartha Shankar Ray complained to U. S. Secretary of State Warren Christopher in their sole meeting that Pakistan was helping Kashmiri terrorists and encouraging them. He was given the answer, "According to our information, this is not happening now."

Our diplomats have begun to strongly believe that Western intelligence can get information only to an extent, and not more than that. Therefore, as the Indian sources indicate, Kashmiri terrorists are still getting help from outside, and we should take this information seriously. The fact is that the permanent secretary of the British Foreign Commonwealth Office, Sir David Gillmore, repeated the same comments given by Prime Minister John Major during his trip to New Delhi last year. He said, "We believe that the best way is to find a solution according to the Shimla Agreement. Steps should be taken to implement a sincere political process by talks, respect human rights in Kashmir, and stopping outside aid to the terrorists which is creating most of the problems."

According to one analysis, the mercenary terrorists across the border are facing a new problem. There is such a heavy concentration of Indian soldiers on the border that the mercenary soldiers, if they enter Kashmir, find it difficult to go back. This analysis indicates that those terrorists are acting like daredevils.

When the prime minister sits down to review the situation, he will find that the basic facts cannot be clouded by analysis. One fact is that there still exists the feeling of our being the outsiders among the people who live in Kashmir. Because of the lack of information among our security forces, they committed atrocities against the people, which strengthened this feeling.

When the prime minister talked with Muslim ministers, senators, and others about Kashmir and invited them to find a solution, this issue was raised again during the talks. The following people participated in this discussion: Jaffar Sharif, Ghulam Nabi Azad, Salman Khursheed, Ahmed Patel, Saifuldin Sauz, and Farooq Abdullah.

The prime minister is making Farooq Abdullah the New Delhi spokesman for Kashmir. One thing he will understand very soon is that we kept the DULF [expansion not given] leaders in Sri Lanka so close to us that they lost the respect of the Tamils there. This resulted in the rise of the LTTE [Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam]. We know that Farooq Abdullah is not very popular in the valley. Perhaps by appointing him spokesman for human rights in the Geneva Human Rights Conference, we have totally destroyed his credibility in the valley.

*** Commentary Notes 'Pakistani Complicity' in Kashmir**

BK1702062894 Delhi All India Radio Network
in English 0245 GMT 17 Feb 94

[Commentary by Kanchan Gupta]

[Text] For a long time now, it has been clear that both the Government of Pakistan as well as certain organizations have been playing an active role in instigating and organizing violence in the Kashmir Valley apart from preaching separatism among the people. India has extensive documentation to prove this point and the material has been presented to Western governments as evidence of Pakistan's role in sponsoring transborder terrorism.

There have been detailed reports filed by independent journalists to further substantiate Pakistani complicity in disturbing the peace in Kashmir. However, every time such evidence is made public, either by the Government of India or the national media, Pakistan has been prompt in denouncing it as a propaganda. Ironically, it is the Pakistani media which has now begun to publish reports that provide indisputable evidence of Islamabad's support to terrorists. For instance, the FRONTIER POST, a well-known newspaper published from Peshawar and Lahore, has been publishing a series of articles and news reports which reveal the extent to which fundamentalist religio-political parties and organizations that enjoy official and quasi-official patronage have been sending across trained young men to Kashmir. The newspaper has also reported how some of these organizations whose camps are attended by Pakistani Army officers have been planning the kidnapping and killing of security personnel on duty in the valley.

All this, of course, is not news as far as India is concerned. There can be no doubt that the ISI [Inter Service Intelligence] is not the only Pakistani outfit which has its fingers firmly in the Kashmiri pie; so have the Jamaat-i-Islami and its allied organizations. Yet, the Pakistani Government led by Ms. Benazir Bhutto has have no compunction in trying to make political capital out of the strife and violence that is a handiwork of its agencies.

At the ongoing UN Human Rights Commission conference in Geneva, Ms. Bhutto has sought to propagate the Pakistani allegation of human rights violations resorting to the old tactics of repeating a lie again and again so that it appears to have a kernel of truth. But the propaganda blitz is unlikely to cut much ice. Now that even the Pakistani media has begun to divulge the truth, it is only a matter of time before the cat leaps out of the bag. It will not be surprising if following the spate of reports in the Pakistani newspapers Islamabad decides to impose press censorship to suppress the cold facts. But all this can only have a cosmetic effect for there is no power which can suppress the truth for ever, and the truth is that Pakistan driven by territorial greed is instigating and fanning violence in Kashmir.

*** Aggressive Posture Against Militants Favored**

94AS0212E Madras INDIAN EXPRESS in English
17 Feb 94 p 8

[Article by Prakash Singh, former director general of Border Security Force: "To Win the Kashmir War"]

[Text] Kashmir represents the greatest threat to national security today. The separatist movement constitutes the biggest challenge the country has faced to its unity and integrity since the dawn of Independence. Is the problem intractable? Is there no way out? Are we sinking into a quagmire? I don't think so. I believe that if some hard decisions are taken, the situation will definitely change, and from the long term point of view, for the better.

There is no getting away from the grim reality that infiltrations will have to be stopped or at least very substantially reduced if we are to contain militancy in the valley. The security forces, despite the fact that they operate in an unfriendly and inhospitable environment, are doing a commendable job. Militants are being apprehended and liquidated every day. Seizures of arms, ammunition and explosives is a continuing process. Their figures make an impressive tally.

The fact remains that Pakistan has been replenishing the militants' losses. It is a running battle between losses suffered by militants on one hand and fresh induction of trained personnel, Kashmiri and other nationalities on the other. Our objective must be to see that losses are more than the accretions. It is difficult to say if we have arrived at that balance yet. We have to remember that Pakistan has been pumping in enormous resources to keep the Kashmir pot boiling.

That being the situation, it is essential that the movement of men and material across the line of control is reduced to a trickle. This was achieved in Punjab. Today, when people talk with a sense of euphoria over terrorism having been contained in that state, they forget that it happened only after the border was virtually sealed by barriers, human and artificial ones, ensuring that the supply of oxygen in the form of weaponry and infiltration was choked. Once that happened, the flame of terrorism naturally withered.

How do we translate that in the situation obtaining in Kashmir? The border is being patrolled as effectively as it could be by the Indian Army and the BSF. Yet the configuration of hills being what it is infiltration continues. Fencing the undulating snow-covered peaks is impossible. My suggestion is that the valley should be fenced along the slopes of the hills. It would amount to raising a barrier along the points where the hills descend into the valley. The idea is that we should insulate the valley from the surrounding hills, particularly in the Pir Panjal Range. Once that is achieved, the security forces will be able to decimate the terrorists in the bowl. I am not saying that the hills should be cut off or left unguarded. Movement from the valley to the hills or vice versa should only be through gates which would be manned by the security forces and where any person going either way could be thoroughly frisked. The existing deployment of forces in the hill ranges should continue and operations not only sustained but also stepped up to the extent possible within the existing resources.

The strategy should be to stop infiltrations, deal with those who manage to enter the hills and, finally, prevent their entry into the valley at any cost. Fencing paid dividends in Punjab. There is no reason why it should not give results in Kashmir where the militants' losses are being made up all the time. Borders have to be secured and infiltration reduced to the minimum if we are to break the backbone of militancy. Beyond a point pumping in more battalions on internal security cannot lead us anywhere.

The Jamaat-e-Islami is the soul of militancy in the valley. We allowed this organisation to proliferate during the last several decades. "Madarsas" were opened by the Jamaat in every nook and corner of the state. The ideological indoctrination of the young minds caused havoc. The youth today frequently seen throwing stones or brandishing weapons are products of the "madarsas". It is unfortunate that when the seeds of poison were being sown, no action was taken and the State Government preferred to look the other way.

Jamaat-e-Islami provides the ideological motivation, sustains and supports the separatists. Unless we strike at this institution, it will be futile to expect militancy to be liquidated or even controlled. Jamaat-e-Islami is a banned organisation and yet no action has been taken against its members in J&K.

It is unfortunate that the loyalties of a section of the government employees are open to question. They are like Trojan horses in our camp. The security forces feel particularly bitter about the attitude of these functionaries on sensitive issues. They feel hamstrung in their operational efforts in the absence of cooperation from the local administration. These government employees are an unashamed lot and their brazenness is shocking. Some even contribute a certain percentage of their salary every month to the militants' coffers. It is a perverse kind of peaceful co-existence. Their conduct is a great damper to the moderate and sensible Kashmiris who are puzzled that the Government does not take action against its own employees having a nexus with militant organisations. It is an open secret that several senior officers of the State Government signed a petition to the UNO against the Government of India a few years back. What loyalty or commitment could be expected of them is anybody's guess.

Why can't we take action against them under Article 311(2) and have these employees sacked? It is not necessary to sack all and sundry. Exemplary action against even fifty employees conveys the message.

If there is one lesson to be learnt from Punjab, it is that the State Police holds the key to tackling terrorism or insurgency. There is no doubt that the army and the paramilitary forces made tremendous contribution to controlling terrorism in Punjab. However, only after the Punjab Police was revived by Rebeiro and given the required punch by K. P. S. Gill did the tide turn.

Such a transformation is yet to take place in J&K. The State Police has to demonstrate the will to fight the militants. It needs a strong injection of strength, perhaps from outside. We should be able to send hand-picked IPS officers for a minimum of one year tenure to serve in J&K. Accelerated promotions could be the incentive. The modalities can be worked out, but the important thing is to give officers of appropriate calibre to the state at all levels. It is not that J&K Police is incapable of taking on the militants. It is, however, thirsting for dynamic leadership. Once that is given, it would certainly show better results.

Time is running out fast in Kashmir. Pakistan is getting desperate. It is high time that a well-coordinated plan of action is worked out and pursued with vigour.

*** Warning Issued on Attempts to Internationalize Kashmir**

94AS0219E Varanasi AJ in Hindi 18 Feb 94 pp 1, 10

[Unattributed article: "Pakistan Warned Not To Raise Kashmir As An International Issue and Jeopardize Secretary-Level Talks"]

[Text] New Delhi, 17 February—India has warned Pakistan that if it presents the Kashmir resolution in the Geneva Human Rights Commission meeting, then foreign secretary-level talks between the two countries will be hurt.

A Foreign Ministry spokesman said here today that if Pakistan continues to pressure for the introduction of this resolution, then bilateral talks will be endangered. The spokesman said, "The whole world knows that Pakistan has nothing to do with human rights in the Kashmir issue; it just wants to take political advantage of this issue."

The spokesman said that India was still intent on resolving the problem between the two countries through talks. He said that the prime minister has clearly indicated that India is committed to talking to Pakistan about Kashmir and all other issues.

The spokesman expressed the hope that Pakistan would not introduce the Kashmir resolution in Geneva. He said that India has already told all member nations about Pakistan's real reason for introducing the resolution. "All countries are aware of Pakistan's goal and also of Pakistan's involvement in Kashmir," he said.

Foreign Minister Salman Khursheed made it clear at the Human Rights Commission meeting yesterday that Pakistan is not qualified to talk about human rights, because its own record in this area is very bad. He said that India has supported bilateral talks on all issues in Pakistan; it also supports talks according to the Shimla Agreement.

He said that India sent a six-point proposal to Pakistan to increase mutual trust; however, Pakistan did not even consider sending a formal reply.

*** BJP President Denounces U.S. 'Interference' Over Kashmir**

BK0103030994 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English
18 Feb 94 p 13

[Excerpt] New Delhi—Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) president L.K. Advani on Thursday called upon the Government to tell the United States in clear and unambiguous language that its President Bill Clinton's observations on Jammu and Kashmir constituted an "un-friendly" act towards India. It amounted to an unwarranted and intolerable interference in the internal affairs of the country.

Advani reacted to Clinton's recent statements which were earlier criticised by BJP spokespersons and its external affairs cell with a view to put the Kashmir issue into focus on the national agenda. The observations made by Clinton while accepting credentials of the Pakistani ambassador were totally against diplomatic norms as such occasions were never used to attack a third country, Advani said.

He reiterated that Kashmir was an integral part of India and the Indian people were confident of safeguarding its territory. He said the present US stand on Kashmir was against its earlier view in which it had recognised Kashmir as an integral part of India. [passage omitted]

*** Security Forces Fault Government Planning in Kashmir**

94AS0231C Cochin THE WEEK in English 20 Feb 94
p 35

[Article by Vijaya Pushkarna: "Unsung Heroes"—quotation marks as published]

[Text] The state resembles a sprawling cantonment. Most of the vehicles seen on the roads belong to the security forces who have their bunkers after nearly every 300 metres. They have also taken on lease most of the cinema halls, hotels and commercial establishments in the towns.

The strength of the security forces deployed in the state has doubled between 1989 and 1991, after it was decided to seal the porous borders. In the three-tier system of defence, army jawans man the forwardmost areas; the second line is looked after by the BSF [Border Security Forces] while the BSF and the CRPF [Central Reserve Police Force] are deployed in the towns and villages.

The first success came when the infiltration of about 3,500 Pak-trained militants was thwarted. They were forced to spend the winter across the border, with the cordon and search operations in full swing. The crack-down led to the nabbing of Mushtaq Ahmed Zargar, the supreme commander of Al Umar. Altaf Qureishi, chief

of the Ikhwan-ul-Musalmeen, was killed. And then came Sopore, supposedly a "liberated zone," which has been won back by the security forces, forcing many militants to flee the valley.

Around the same time, stray reports of the atrocities of militants on fellow Kashmiris started trickling in. The number of such complaints is on the rise. "A seven-year-old girl and five married women walked into a BSF bunker to escape some militants who tried to molest them. We were able to catch the culprits and the women became our 'cats' (informers). Two of them were later killed but we have given protection and jobs in the CRPF to the others," said an officer.

In Srinagar city, as in Sopore, it is the men of the BSF who are "holding on to the land." The bunker walls are made of sand bags, the roofs of tin. The flooring is generally the waterlogged slushy roadside and the air inside stinks, whether it is Chhattarbal, Saida Kadal or Karan Nagar. The freezing temperatures add to the woes of the security forces who have to keep a constant vigil. The shots can come from a window or door of any of the three-storeyed houses in all the four directions.

More than the cruel weather, it is the 'virtual abandonment' by the government that the security forces lament about the most. "When our soldiers are killed by these cowards who use human shields there is no human rights violation. There is no good word for the restraint shown by us to ensure that no civilian is killed. And then to expect us to sit back and watch our men being fired at, whether in Bijbehara, or Kupwara! Where are our human rights?" asked an officer.

The recent killing of Maj Bhupender Singh of the Border Roads Organisation is cited as an example of the government's callous attitude to the man in the bunker. "When the government releases some guys it demoralises us. The pain becomes worse when we see that there is no consistent policy. For five days they were negotiating and bargaining over the life of Bhupender Singh. But he did not seem to matter," said a colleague of his.

The manner in which the Hazratbal incident was allowed to drift to has upset the forces. While it may have helped the government as far as world pressure was concerned, it was a setback for them. The militants used the 32-day siege to effect large-scale transfers of their men from one district to another. The 'cats' or *mukhbirs*, who help identify the militants from the suspects rounded up, became helpless after that.

The security forces also feel that the government has not planned the anti-militancy drive well. The Punjab government, they point out, had announced big awards on the heads of wanted men, giving a share to the informers as well. Such an incentive would increase the list of informers, they argue.

Despite the strong resentment against the government, the forces have been moving around, trying to win back the Kashmiris. The BSF set up a clinic and posted a

doctor to provide medical care to women and children in the downtown areas. But those who turned up were threatened by the militants.

For the security forces, it is a plain and simple war, where the enemy is well-armed, well-trained and well-funded. "If we die, we may get only an award," lamented a jawan.

It was clear that unless other inputs went into solving the Kashmir problem, the majority of the jawans posted to internal security duties would put in their papers at the earliest pensionable opportunity. "Given the fact that 45 battalions are posted in J&K and that we have a two-year posting now (earlier it was four years), we will be back here after four years. For, a third of the BSF is deployed here," explained an officer.

*** Kashmir Problem Viewed More Intractable Than Punjab**

94AS0231B Cochin THE WEEK in English 20 Feb 94 pp 33-34

[Article by Vijaya Pushkarna: "Punjab No Model"]

[Text] Can Kashmir be brought around like Punjab was? It [is] not a question that New Delhi is asking itself, but a hope it is cherishing. The manner in which it handled the Hazratbal crisis and the fact that some people are fed up with militancy have boosted the government's optimism, though casualties among the troops are increasing.

But there is little in common between Punjab and Kashmir, except the gun.

"Equating the two is doing us great injustice," says Prof. Abdul Gani of the Muslim Conference. "Punjab is an integral part of India, the Sikh's was a cultural revolt against the Hindus. Here it is a political problem. We don't say we are Muslims and so give us certain rights."

This view finds wide support in Srinagar. The people point to J&K's [Jammu and Kashmir] disputed status, and the international interest in it, which were absent in Punjab's case. And they bluntly reject any package, economic or political, saying that they had never demanded concessions of any kind.

There is a host of other differences. Pakistan never claimed a right on Punjab, though it helped the militants, and the people of Punjab and Pakistan had nothing in common. Pakistani infiltration of Punjab was a fraction of what it has been in J&K. While buses from Lal Chowk have taken boys to Rawalpindi and Muzaffargarh, no such buses had gone from Punjab. The sealing of Punjab border was effective but it is impossible on the Kashmir border, from where one can trek to Muzaffargarh overnight in summer.

The Punjab militant may have been far more deadly than the Kashmiri but he was backed by no more than 15 percent of the population. In Kashmir the security forces

assess the support to be 60 percent. Till two years ago, the Kashmiri militant seeking shelter was given a hero's welcome, completed with a 36-course *wazwan* (feast) and there would be nightlong *wunwun* (music). The Punjab militant got nothing like that.

The police sympathise with the militants, the government officers give them a day's salary every month, and the politicians have decided to keep out. Even the judiciary is suspect.

Without the help of the police the security forces can do little. In Punjab it was J.F. Riberio and K.P.S. Gill who had called the shots, the security forces were merely assisting them. In Kashmir the army, BSF [Border Security Force] and CRPF [Central Reserve Police force] handle the law and order—a task for which they are not equipped. But they are confident of ending the problem in less than a year if the police really start working.

In Punjab the turnaround came when the difference between criminals and militants disappeared. In Kashmir the militants have not lost their heroic aura. For fear of agents provocateurs infiltrating their ranks and dirtying their organisations, militant leaders like Shabir Shah have ordered a thorough screening of every recruit. The people who are ready to take on the militants are just a handful, says a security officer. Some do it out of grudge, some are fed up with atrocities, some rat for a consideration.

Punjab was easier terrain. Most showdowns and encounters were in the open fields. There was not much chance of innocent citizens getting caught in the crossfire. In Kashmir, the militants fire from the windows and the security men are forced to shoot back at the buildings, harming innocents. "Even when they come out in the open and fire, they do it from behind a human shield, often of small children and women. We try not to harm the people, but if a jawan is killed, the others don't care," said an officer.

The demographic profiles, too, vary. In Punjab, the Hindus are only marginally fewer than the Sikhs, but in Kashmir the Muslims have overwhelming majority. Even Ladakh has 48 percent Muslims, and Jammu 34 percent. In Punjab, elections could be held with good Hindu and urban turnout; it preempted criticism that the government was unrepresentative. Any such effort in Kashmir will have little success.

Besides, there is the political vacuum. The politicians are reluctant even to visit the valley. In Punjab, at least a few parties carried on their campaign and shaped the public opinion. The CPI [Communist Party of India], the Congress and the BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party] paid a heavy price, but remained staunchly anti-terrorist.

Kashmir requires a different touch. Right now, no solution is possible without the involvement of the Huriyat Conference or some of its constituents. Hurried elections may only deepen the mire in a place where rigging has fuelled the fury.

Governor K.V. Krishna Rao has been trying to push the politicians into the valley. "They have been making all kinds of excuses, out of fear," he says. Gulam Nabi Shaheen, the Srinagar block president of the National Conference who lives in Jammu, believes that his party can play a mediatory role. But "for a political process to be successful, it is imperative that the government talks to Shabir Shah, Yaseen Malik and others. First, the guns have to be silenced, and all detainees released unconditionally," he says. "Elections now will achieve nothing."

Ali Mohammad Sagar, minister in Farooq's cabinet, too, lives in Jammu. "At least 20 ex-MLAs [members of Legislative Assembly] have been killed," says Sagar who believes that bringing Farooq will not help. "Listen to people like Shabir Shah," he tells the government. "Many militant leaders are seasoned, educated, qualified and have a following. There are those who abhor the gun culture. If Laldenga and Prafulla Mahanta can be won over, why not these people? Don't make it a prestige issue, take a humane view."

Others too want Shabir Shah and Yaseen Malik to be won over, though they don't say it in so many words. Veteran Congressman Sardar Rangeel Singh, who was in the cabinet of Syed Mir Qasim and Sheikh Abdullah, says "the old leadership has become redundant" and former party general secretary Mangat Ram Sharma is for harnessing Muslim nationalist forces.

Says BJP leader Chaman Lal Gupta: "If we eliminate the gun and hold elections, leaders will be thrown up. If Shabir Shah and Yaseen Malik are elected to power under the Constitution of India, we should accept it. But it has to be a very fair and free election."

Members of the Huriyat pooh-pooh the talk of political process. "Any political process will have to be in a country outside India and Pakistan, with international guarantees," says Javied Ahmed Mir, acting chief of the Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front. Prof. Gani calls it a political prattle since a political process that does not address the basic issue of the dispute will serve no purpose.

According to Mian Abdul Quayoom, another member of the Huriyat, the only acceptable process involves demilitarisation of the region. UN trusteeship of it for five years, election of an interim government, and self-determination by the people. Huriyat chairman Mirwaiz Maulvi Umar Farooq too rejects a political process and Shabir Shah himself calls it nonsense.

Interestingly, there are people who assert that Farooq Abdullah is the de facto chief of the JKLF [Jammu Kashmir Liberation Front] and that it will do what he wants. Says Mushtaq Ahmed Lone, former National Conference MLA: "Dr Farooq Abdullah is a founder of the JKLF movement." The JKLF, however, has dismissed it as a canard.

Is Dr Abdullah, who recently paid a visit to Kashmir, still relevant otherwise? To New Delhi, he, being a

nationalist, is a trump card to be played at international fora. Besides, people over 45 still have a sympathy for his party. And as Mangat Ram Sharma says he is a bird in hand and is better than two in the bush.

Whatever it be, most people believe that 1994 cannot be the election year in the valley. "Give me the choice between my job and being a returning officer, and I will quit," says a bureaucrat. Even the security forces say no elections will be possible in the very near future. "The people are too petrified to go to the polls," says an officer.

All the same, New Delhi may not depend on the advice of the security forces, partly because it feels that they have developed vested interests in militancy—even though it does not give credence to allegations that border tracts are put to auction for collecting fabulous sums offered by the militants as bribes to let them cross the border. Besides, with mounting international pressure, India may have to force certain things, as Home Minister S.B. Chavan has put it.

ABDUL GANI: MUSLIM CONFERENCE

The 56-year-old professor of Persian was dismissed from government service in 1986, on the grounds that he was a potential threat to the security of the country. "A professor is a professor. He enjoys the academic freedom to talk, to express himself sufficiently on any subject," he says.

"In that capacity, I called a spade a spade. I considered all along that the Kashmir dispute would not only bring untold misery to the people of the state but also lead to wars between India and Pakistan. You can keep the people against their wishes for a time, not all time. That's a lesson I learnt from history. The professor is unequivocal about his preference: accession to Pakistan.

MD ASHRAF SAHRAI: JAMA'AT ISLAMIA

The Jama'at Islamia of J&K may not be the biggest political party or constituent of the Huriyat Conference, but its power lies in the fact that its military wing, the Hizbul Mujahdeen, is the most dreaded outfit, with a cadre whose fire power is matched by its motivation. Though the Islamia talks about the Kashmiris' right to self-determination, it is in favour of Kashmir's merger with Pakistan.

That is why Mohammad Ashraf Sahrai, general secretary of the Islamia, has been attracting attention. "The only political parties in the war zone," he says, "are the Jama'at Islamia and the Awami Action Committee." Incidentally, Sahrai is proud of protecting temples in Kupwara from an angry procession.

* Difficulties in Kashmir Seen Spiraling

94AS0231A Cochin THE WEEK in English 20 Feb 94 pp 28-32

[Article by Vijaya Pushkarna: "Living Death"]

[Text] Srinagar is a city sedated, groggy and gangrenous, a city where laughter has been ripped off the lips of its

children. At six in the evening it looks like a sick man curled up under thick dark blankets, the shops have their shutters rolled down, the unlit streets have fallen silent and empty. "It is the first time in years that I am switching on the lights of my car," says Aijaz Ahmed, one of the lucky businessmen who has not yet been knocked into the pits of despair by the chaos that reigns in the valley.

Aijaz, 38, recently took his family from the sub-zero temperatures of Srinagar to Jammu, the sunny winter capital of the state. There their greatest source of joy was Tamil director Mani Ratnam's *Roja*, a film about the efforts of a woman to save her husband held hostage by Kashmiri militants.

The film is widely known in Srinagar, but not many have seen it thanks to the militants who have imposed a ban on cinemas and video libraries. They have also banned cultural programmes, clubs, beauty parlours and bars. Even a game of cards is sinful. During a house-to-house search by the security forces in downtown Srinagar, a Kashmir University lecturer has only one frantic plea to the officer. "Don't let anyone know that you have found video-cassettes in my house," she begs in tears.

It is mirthless life for the young and the growing. They live without fun, there is no entertainment, and even school day celebrations are a thing of the past. A bureaucrat, who paid heavily for openly sympathising with the militant movement, pities his children. "They are growing up in a well," he says. "They have no non-Muslims friends, they don't know what evening life is, what evening light is. My young son, most likely, will get killed looking for *azadi*."

A lot of things that the Kashmiris cherished have already died. Houseboat hospitality is foundering, *shikaras* have disappeared from the weed-grown Dal Lake, the tourist industry has collapsed, the economy has a huge hole in its heart. Yet Mohammad Amin Mir, owner of two houseboats, smiles. Offering tea and the warmth of the *kangri* to beat the biting cold, he says, "You have come here and spoken to us in English and Hindustani. For the first time in years, I almost feel as if a tourist is back."

The "years" that Aijaz and Mir are talking about is the period beginning December 1989, more specifically the day Rubiya Sayeed, the daughter of the then Union home minister, Mufti Mohammad Sayeed, was kidnapped by the militants. The owner of Welcome Hotel on the famed boulevard across the Dal Lake remembers how life began to deteriorate for him and others in the city from that day. "All our guests fled, even though they had booked the rooms for a week or more," he recalls. The next day, he closed shop.

Till then, he had thought that elections would be held and the situation would improve in the state that had been under President's rule ever since an angry Farooq Abdullah tendered his resignation over the appointment

of Jagmohan as the Governor. In the next five days, the half a dozen three-star hotels on the boulevard were closed down. Many hotels all over the valley have met with the same fate.

The owner of Welcome Hotel entered the highly competitive carpet business, lost his money and has let rust eat his factory. Many other owners have rented out their hotels, earning handsome returns from the security forces—and death threats and ransom notes from the militants. Sandbag bunkers and gun-wielding men in olive greens and khaki—not camera-toting tourists in bright colours—mark hotels like Centaur.

Mohammed Amin Mir, the young houseboat owner who used to give tourists the Kashmir experience and earn Rs 1 lakh a season, today digs up the banks of the Jhelum for daily wages of Rs 30. There is no work on rainy and snowy days, and not all sunny days are productive. Firings and grenade-lobbing, which lead to hartals, often rob him of income and even if everything is fine he would not go far looking for work for fear of the bunkers along the way.

"We are able to survive on our savings and the meagre earnings. But how will I maintain the houseboats?" he asks. He has to spend Rs 6,000 to 8,000 for the maintenance of each boat every year. "Earlier it used to be six months work and six months rest. Now it is crackdown, curfew and hartal, at least three days a week," he says.

His uncle Ghulam Ahmad Khan hawks rubber slippers on the pavements on safe days. "Tonight is Shabbi Barat, a big day for us Muslims, when we go to the mosque and be there all night. But now nobody leaves the house, and every time I get back home, I think it is a rebirth," he says though he has never been picked up by the security forces.

A hundred of the 2,000 houseboat owners at Dal Lake have travel agencies to fall back on, the others have fallen flat. It is hard times even for Mohammad Iqbal Chapri, 79, the founder president of the Houseboat Owners' Association—his brother is the present president—and one of his sons and a grandson work as domestic help for some Swede engineers at Uri. The Chapri family did not turn to the carpet and handicrafts industry because they have been houseboat people for the last 250 years. Says Chapri: "A shawl person cannot manage a houseboat or trekking, and I cannot make and sell shawls."

It has been a road to despair for taxicabs, too. In 1989 there were 4,000 of them in Srinagar and Badgam districts. Now there are only 1,700. "The television says the Mujahdeen do not let us accept the relief that the government is giving us. But the fact is that the government is not giving us anything, we have not even been exempted from paying the tax on the cabs," says G.M. Kundroo, general secretary of Tourist Taxi Stand Drivers Union.

While Kundroo blames the presence of the security forces for the poor tourist traffic and claims that the militants do nothing that hits tourism, many others think otherwise. Rashid, a houseboat-owner-turned-cabbie, was kidnapped by the militants along with two American botanists from whom they demanded Rs 5 lakh. "but to our good luck, another group of militants intervened and we were let off," says Rashid, who has found the security forces more considerate than many militant groups.

The worst affected in the city seem to be the *shikarawalas* who used to ferry people down the Jhelum to houseboats in the Dal Lake. There are only a dozen *shikaras* at the Dal Gate Ghats which means most of the 1,800 workers are out of jobs. Their union secretary, Khazar Mohammad Kalu, a hunter of daily wages now, says many in his trade have migrated to Jammu, Goa and Delhi and that 400 *shikaras* have been abandoned for want of money to repair them.

It is not only those in the tourism trade who have lost out. The bleakness has invaded everyone's bone-marrow. Tailor Mohammad Ayub Khan is out of work not because his Hindu customers fled the area, but because his shop is next to a BSF bunker. Khan, who had eight employees in the good old days, has no more [than] two uniforms to mend. The commanding officer of the BSF unit had recommended that Khan's daughter Yasimjan be employed by the district administration but, after many visits, he is a disillusioned man. "If I had the money to buy her a job, would I not have got her married?" he asks. The militants have not helped him either. "They are collecting money for themselves," he says.

Baskets woven by Ghulam Rasool Shaksaz, who lives near the Hazratbal mosque, used to be taken to Calcutta and other far off places by traders. Now the traders just don't come. Till a few months ago, he carried on making *kangris* for visitors to the mosque, which is now virtually closed. Yet he thanks Allah and cheerfully says: "The crisis has shown what a goldmine Kashmir is. People are carrying on without income. That shows the potential of the place."

Most business establishments in Srinagar don't open, and the businessmen have forgotten what credit, *bilti*, or LOC [line of control] means. The carry-and-forward agents of all the major companies have shifted to Jammu. Credit cards are of no use, most banks have closed down their branches. The few that have not, have massive security and endless queues. Indian Airlines does not sell tickets directly, STD [Subscriber Trunk Dialing (telephone)] and ISD [International Subscriber Dialing] booths are non-existent. Courier services deliver packets, but they cannot airfreight packets from Srinagar.

From sunset to eight in the morning, there is no movement of people, no light on the streets, and even the paramilitary vehicles do not turn on lights for fear of attacks. There is chronic power shutdown but even those

who can afford generators do not go for them, for that would invite unnecessary attention, possibly dangerous, to the buyer.

The Dak Bungalow in Jammu had some visitors from the valley, who had come not to see *Roja*, but to play at cards! A good hand of rummy with four packs seem to be a favourite of a number of middle-aged Kashmiris, but they seldom play in the valley for fear of the son and his gun. "The militants have banned card games, and nobody knows whether his son is with this group or that. We play only behind closed doors in Srinagar and if there is a knock, we will hide the cards before opening the door," said a card game enthusiast.

The lack of trust, the lurking suspicion between sons and fathers, the young and the old, is part of the tragedy that is Kashmir. The old seem to be afraid of the young who are fascinated by the gun. They also fear for them. "If we send them out for work, the men in uniform may beat them to death; if they stay home, they are easily tempted by militancy. That is the problem of a father, the government just does not care," says Chapri, whose son Ibrahim was kept blindfolded by the security forces for 16 days in 1990. "As a freedom fighter, I have taught him that violence must be met with violence. My Quran has taught me that. If it is non-violence that I am faced with, I must submit. That is the way all of us here have been educated," he explains why militancy has captured the imagination of the youth.

But there are fathers who attribute the trend more to the prevailing political atmosphere than any kind of indoctrination, formal or otherwise. "Perhaps the new generation will be more violent. My son was six when militancy erupted. His life has been in the atmosphere of guns, rockets, and there has been a reduction in educational facilities and interaction with human beings. Only a psychotherapist can say what damage it has done," says a father who is anguished that the militants are using 12-year-olds to throw grenades at their targets. Raised in such a deadly atmosphere such boys will find happiness only in the rattle of Kalashnikovs.

The boys seem to love it, proud of their self-image as freedom fighters. "I don't know how I got into this movement. Yes, it was in my blood," says Shefat Ahmed, a former student of the reputed Burn Hall boys school. He had been neither trained nor armed, but when "everyone rose, I was chased out into the movement by my family members, who asked me to be a man." He also notes that many top leaders of the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF) were bright students.

There are bad eggs, everyone admits, the types that rape, loot and run wild. But most of the militants burn with the vengeful fury against security forces. For, many militants have been created by them, by roughing up an innocent man or misbehaving with a woman. Such humiliation makes all the boys in the family turn militants.

The crackdowns and house-to-house searches too have turned people against the government. A young man of

Nawath, who has been arrested at least four times in the last one month, believes that it is only because he wears jeans and sneakers that the security forces think that he is a militant. Ghulam Amad Khan says his mentally retarded nephew was detained for three weeks. The alienation is growing, with 3,000 people in jail without trial for more than three years.

"It would have taken us 60 years to get the movement to this stage, but thanks to Jagmohan and the security forces, we have done it in three years," says a lawyer. Another militant mocks at Union Minister Rajesh Pilot's assurance that the relatives will be informed of arrests within 24 hours: "They are now producing bodies in the police stations within three hours. The number of custodial deaths is unimaginable."

The presence of the uniformed forces has hardly instilled confidence in anyone. A woman, who was initially happy that midnight knocks had ceased when the BSF set up a bunker near her house, fears that she would be caught in the crossfire. Army convoys on the streets are a regular sight even when there is no emergency. Recently there was a panic at a market where a row of jeeps screeched to a halt. In this case the fear was absolutely misplaced: the convoy was merely accompanying a major who had come to collect his clothes.

But no one takes chances, particularly after sunset. "If the security forces are ruthless during daytime, they are worse in the evenings when most of them are drunk," says a shopkeeper on Residency Road. The excesses by the militants are either brushed off as canards or ascribed to "guest militants"—Pakistani agents, PLO guerrillas, Afghan killers and the like. A newspaper report that the guest militants are spreading AIDS is read out by militants groups along with warnings about criminals masquerading as great revolutionaries.

The writ of the militants runs in the society despite the jawans crawling all over. "Their parallel courts matter much more than the courts of law," says Sheikh Mukhtiar Ahmed, who had won a case involving Rs 12 lakh. But then the militants backed the other party, and so the verdict is yet to be enforced.

The High Court Bar Association president Mian Abdul Quayoom, a member of the Huriyat Conference, says that there is accountability in the militant outfits. He gives an example: at Arwani near Bijbehara, a Hizbul Mujahdeen militant killed two people making love. The parents went to the Hizbul commander-in-chief, who then ordered the militant's execution.

Not everyone sees the militants in that glorious light. Says a bureaucrat: "We have a gun in front of us, a gun behind us. Anyone with a gun is supreme in Kashmir, whether he is in uniform or not. They are exempted from all rules, laws and civility."

The High Court has 8,000 habeas corpus petitions pending before it. In 1990-91, such petitions formed 85 per cent of all cases, 60 per cent the next year and 40 per cent now. "I don't say that the arrests have stopped, it is just that the interest of lawyers has swung back to more profitable cases. Most of them were handling these habeas corpus writs free," says an official. Quayoom alleges that the judges have been instructed to go slow on habeas corpus petitions. Says he: "In the normal course, a judge would write out the order on the toilet tissue if he got such a petition while sitting on the pot."

The collapse of all branches of government is complete, yet the valley seems very much like the giant chinar tree, waiting for the long and bleak winter in its history to be over, for new leaves to sprout and bring colour and life back. But the present is crushing, abject and hopeless, as the youth growing up in a traumatised land fondle grenades and the tense troops in sandbag bunkers flash terror.

YASEEN AHMED MALIK: PRESIDENT OF THE JKLF

Yaseen Ahmad Malik, 26, has been in jail since 1990. But the incarceration has hardly weakened his will. During his college days, Yaseen founded the Student's League. "He was always an admirer of Maqbool Butt (hanged in 1984), though I don't know what exactly attracted him to the movement," says his sister Amina.

He was first arrested for taking out a procession to protest the dismissal of the Farooq Abdullah government. Released a year later, he was again arrested for reactivating the JKLF. When let off, Yaseen crossed over to Pakistan. He was netted again in August 1990. He can play a major role in shaping Kashmir's future but his health is feeble. He has had open-heart surgery while in custody.

SHABIR SHAH: PEOPLE'S LEAGUE

Shabir Shah, 40, has spent almost half his life in different jails. He was arrested for the first time when he was 14: he had organised a demonstration against the visit of Jayaprakash Narayan to the valley. The J&K [Jammu & Kashmir] People's League, of which he is chairman, was formed a little before the Indira-Abdullah accord which brought the Sheikh back to power in 1975.

Shabir traces his inclination towards secessionist movement to 1968, when "Balraj Madhok came and instigated us, but this feeling really grew in the 70s." He does not concede that the movement for self-determination is inspired by Pakistan. Now, the mainstream parties want the government to hold talks with him.

MIRWAIZ UMAR FAROOQ: AWAMI ACTION COMMITTEE

Umar, 20, became the spiritual leader of the Muslims in the valley after the assassination of his father, Mirwaiz Maulvi Farooq, in May 1990. He is also the chairman of

the Huriyat composed of 34 political and militant groups. "It was my idea to form the Huriyat," he says.

He addresses large crowds every week at the Jama Masjid in Srinagar, where two lakh people gather on the last Friday of the Ramzan month. Every Wednesday a professor comes to his house to help him prepare the speech. And every day three other professors come to teach him Arabic, Islamic Law, Persian and other subjects in his *fazilat* degree course. He is also studying for graduation in political science.

JAVIED AHMAD MIR: ACTING CHIEF, JKLF

A hat and a pair of tinted glasses are part of Javied Ahmed Mir's camouflage. Being on the run has become a way of life for him. He manages to address public meetings without attracting the attention of the security forces.

Javied set up the Islamic Students' League in 1982 and later found a job in the public health engineering department. He has been in and out of the jails for the last four years. The last stint, which was eight months long, was in the Jammu jail with Shabir Shah of the People's League, and his own party chief Yaseen Ahmed Malik.

Javied, 33, claims he has never held a gun. "I belong to the political wing of the movement, not the military wing," he says.

*** U.S. Said Supporting Pakistan Kashmir Position For Own Interests**

Calcutta BARTAMAN in Bengali 20 Feb 94 p 4

[Article by Barun Sengupta: "American Official's Love of Pakistan"]

[Excerpt] American Officials are gradually strengthening their love for Pakistan. The anti-Indian component of this love for Pakistan is apparent in their Kashmir policy.

The recent round of U.S. love for Pakistan began intensifying after Bhutto returned to power. U.S. expressions of love before this were more subdued. Now, the United States is beating the drums and openly offering its love. The United States supported Pakistan at the time of the Bangladesh war. The United States failed at that time to protest the extensive atrocities and murders of civilians committed by the Pakistani army in Bangladesh. On the contrary, the Pakistani military leaders received assistance. After India defeated Pakistan in the Eastern Theater of war [Bangladesh], the United States made all types of arrangements to assure that India would not advance on the Western Theater [Pakistan]. The United States, though, had not then openly supported Pakistani statements on Kashmir. Now they are. They have stated that Kashmir cannot be considered an indisputable part of India. The United States is not even prepared to

recognize the part of Kashmir under Indian control as a part of India. Their position is that all of Kashmir is disputed territory.

Apart from that, recently, the U.S. Government has shed a lot of tears over Kashmir and how the Indian Government has curbed Kashmiri rights and is committing atrocities. Even Clinton is claiming how pained he is over all this. The reason the U.S. Government has suddenly become agitated over Kashmir is its newfound love for Pakistan. If U.S. officials were not under pressure to appease Pakistan, then why would they be crying so much? The main reason for their tears is to avoid criticism by Pakistan and the Muslim world.

There is no doubt that democracy is deep-rooted in American society. They do not want to see people deprived of democratic rights. Americans become very agitated upon hearing that human rights are being violated and governments are torturing their people. But there is no reason to believe that the U.S. Government is fond of human rights. U.S. foreign policy is based on American economic interests. They show interest in the abrogation of human rights when American economic interests are involved. When these interests are involved, they make a hue and cry all over the world.

There are many examples of this in history. Despite this, the United States continues on this path. One example is when the United States some time back made a big fuss over human rights violations in China. Now they have shut up. They are worried about losing markets in China. Thus the United States simply cannot worry about the lack of progress in human rights there.

U.S. officials never raise the subject of Saudi Arabia's lack of democracy or how torture is practiced there. This is due to the Saudis' willingness to keep in mind U.S. economic interests. When Khomeini took power in Iran, however, U.S. officials became worried due to his unwillingness to protect U.S. interests as had the Shah. [passage omitted giving other examples]

Now, the United States is suddenly worried about Kashmir! The concern shown by the United States over human rights violations, however, is really an expression of concern over economic interests there. The United States wants to establish economic domination over Pakistan and needs a military base in Kashmir. Thus, the United States is about to restore aid to Pakistan. The United States wants to take steps to appease Pakistan and the Muslim world.

U.S. officials regard the Kashmir problem as a religious issue for most of the world's Muslims, a jihad to free Muslims from Kafirs. They believe that world Muslim sentiment is involved in this matter. This is why the United States is supporting the Pakistan position.

This explains why U.S. officials are silent over the support for militants which Pakistan offers year after year, creating a nightmare in the region. They have not uttered a word about the atrocities committed by

Pakistani militants in Kashmir. They have not uttered a word about the pitiful plight of Hindus and Buddhists who have been driven from Muslim-majority areas. This despite being the same U.S. officials who threatened Pakistan with terrorist-state designation just some time ago.

The question arises, why is the United States such a lover of Pakistan and appeaser of Muslims? There are many reasons.

First, the United States wants a military base in Kashmir in order to keep an eye on the oil-exporting regions of the Middle-East and Russia. U.S. economic interests in these regions is vital. A military installation would allow U.S. planes and military forces to be rapidly deployed in support of U.S. interests.

The United States is very worried about militant Islam. They view with alarm the regime in Tehran. They know that anti-U.S. sentiment amongst Muslims is still very high after the Gulf War. The Muslim World is not content with simply being regional in scope, they want a place on the world stage. The United States is willing to appease this wish to gain the support of the majority of Muslims.

The United States, by allowing the Muslim world to grow stronger, also creates a check on Russia, India, and China. Thus, these countries will not be able to oppose U.S. economic imperialism.

This is why I have written that U.S. tears shed for Kashmir are not due to human rights violations. They are shed with a view to advancing U.S. economic interests.

*** Advani Says Kashmir 'Non-Negotiable'**

94AS0221C Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA
in English 20 Feb 94 p 32

[Text] Jammu, February 19 (PTI)—The Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) President, Mr. L.K. Advani, said today India must convey a "clear and loud message" to all concerned, including militants, Pakistan and international community, that "Kashmir is an inalienable part of the country and is non-negotiable."

Addressing a press conference here soon after his arrival from New Delhi, Mr. Advani said "we must tell the United States, which has been trying to pressurise India into making some concession on Kashmir, that India regards accession of Jammu and Kashmir to it as final and irrevocable."

He said the BJP was bringing a resolution in the Parliament in this regard and expected unanimity of all members of the Parliament on Kashmir issue.

The country as a whole has to dispel the impression of international community that it could pressurise India on any count with regard to Jammu and Kashmir and

the countrymen have to see that any compromise on Kashmir will have adverse effect on the country's integrity and unity, he said.

The BJP leader criticised the Centre, particularly the external affairs ministry, for its failure to present properly the Indian case relating to Kashmir before world fora.

The United States, which favours the idea of independent Kashmir for its own interests, has been making unfriendly pronouncements and so there was no reason why the Centre should not take them seriously, Mr. Advani said.

The external affairs ministry could not afford to ignore the statement of United States' officials, including President Bill Clinton, who has virtually endorsed Pakistan's viewpoint on Kashmir, he said.

He said the biggest misnomer with the international community was the identity of Kashmir with a section of population in Kashmir valley without realising that Jammu and Kashmir comprises three regions with different religious and linguistics groupings.

The Central government should have brought it to the knowledge of the international community along the plight of nearly 2.50 lakh [250,000 thousand] displaced Hindus from Valley due to the proxy war waged by Pakistan.

"There cannot be greater case of suppression of human rights that almost entire minority community of Hindus from Kashmir has become refugees in their own country and still the Centre keeps speaking on human rights in an apologetic way," he said.

Pakistan is responsible for violation of human rights in Kashmir where so many thousands of people got killed due to sponsored militancy from across the border and security forces were fighting this proxy war with tight hands.

Mr. Advani said he met recently two British ambassadors to India and Pakistan in New Delhi and explained them his party's viewpoint on Kashmir.

Replying a question on Kashmir, the government, headed by Mr. Narasimha Rao, should quit in view of, what he called, its failure on the Kashmir issue, Mr. Advani said.

However, he blamed the Centre for its policy on Kashmir from the late 1989 when the first episode of kidnapping of Dr Rubiya Sayeed, the daughter of the then home minister, Mr. Mufti Mohammad Sayeed, took place.

He alleged even on the Hazratbal issue, the Centre acted badly by releasing militants, including Pak officials.

Asked if Dr Farooq Abdullah could play a positive role in the present situation, Mr. Advani said "the basic issue

is absence of policy and perspective and not the individuals, bankruptcy of policy could lead to more complications as it has been happening all these years," he said.

*** Rao Summit With Clinton Urged To Overcome Misunderstanding**

94AS0212J Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English
20 Feb 94 p 8

[Article by Sankarshan Thakur: "Through a Kashmir Prism"]

[Text] Few among the Youth Congress supporters tossing a bloated effigy of Mr. Bill Clinton at Wagah last fortnight would have realised the symbolic significance of their protest. The image of Mr. Clinton being desecrated on the Indo-Pakistani border was a statement on how yoked relations between India and the United States remain to Pakistan. After all, it was not Ms. Benazir Bhutto's effigy being banded around at Wagah. It was the U.S. head of state's.

Pakistan remains the thorn in India's side. The U.S. remains the prime agitator of that thorn in India's flesh. Consider how manageable Pakistan would be if the United States was taken off the scene. Handling Islamabad suddenly begins to appear so easy. None of that transcontinental arm twisting from Ms. Robin Raphel. None of those irritable "My dear Ghulam" letters from the Oval Office. None of those words of encouragement to secessionist elements in Kashmir and Punjab.

There was a time Pakistan looked manageable even with U.S. backing—as long as the Soviet Union was around. Nothing deterred India from liberating Bangladesh from Pakistan, not Messrs Richard Nixon or Henry Kissinger, not even the U.S. Seventh Fleet.

But things have changed since then. And South Block gives the impression it has not quite adjusted to these changes. The Soviet Union is a thing of the past. The great protector is no longer hovering behind India's shoulders. There is no longer the assurance of a Soviet veto at the United Nations security council to shield India from U.S. bullying.

Russia votes with Washington at the UN on resolutions deemed anti-Indian in New Delhi. On the nuclear nonproliferation treaty and the missile technology control regime, Washington and Moscow have the same thing to tell India. Sign on the dotted line. Hence Russia's stalling the sale of cryogenic rocket technology to India under pressure from the United States. Even on Kashmir Moscow's position lies closer to Washington's than New Delhi's.

India can no longer behave like a foetus in a protected Cold War womb. It needs to brave the new world and walk a hard path alone. The Clinton administration has done little of late that would not leave India wondering about US intentions in the region. The pinpricks have not been limited to the outbursts of Ms. Robin Raphel,

assistant secretary of state for south Asia. Mr. Clinton himself has repeatedly left South Block aghast, most recently with his statement to the incoming Pakistani ambassador to the United States.

Often representations to Mr. Clinton, like the recent one on Punjab from a set of congressmen, have been products of myth and ignorance. The letter referred to Punjab as the "Republic of Khalistan" and spoke of 110,000 deaths in the state. If the US president responds to such propaganda with kind lines of cooperation, he is bound to raise hackles in South Block.

But then, like it or not, the US is in a position to get away with myth and ignorance. Such is the position it has come to enjoy, particularly after the demise of the Soviet Union. It does not serve to merely rail against a position, however false and unjust, that the United States takes.

The present lot of disconcerting noises from Washington has sparked a debate in the foreign office on whether the prime minister, Mr. P. V. Narasimha Rao, should go to the United States for a summit meeting with Mr. Clinton. There are camps for either side of the argument. But the reigning opinion in South Block seems to be Mr. Rao should not make the trip unless he wants his "nose rubbed in the ground," unless he is "soliciting a blow to national honour". The debate is rather presumptuous, if not also self-defeating.

It is not as if the U.S. administration is waiting with a red carpet to welcome Mr. Rao, terribly anxious to get bilateral irritants out of the way. As it is Mr. Clinton has little time for foreign policy matters and India would figure fairly low on his list. It would hardly bother the White House if Mr. Rao were to decide not to go. It has been argued the prime minister's decision not to visit Washington—and go to Moscow instead—would send the right signals of annoyance to the United States. What is more likely to be the case is there will be nobody in Washington bothered enough to receive the signal.

Rightly or wrongly, the onus for correcting the current imbalances in Indo-U.S. relations is on India. If India can say it is not bothered about bad relations with the United States, Washington would be even less so. The question is what will India lose if its prime minister visits Washington for a meeting with the U.S. president. The situation does not become worse if a Rao-Clinton summit does not produce a positive turn in relations.

The truth is India does not matter to the United States as much as the United States matters to India.

Besides, as representatives of the U.S. administration, including the belligerent Ms. Raphel and the U.S. charge d'affaires in New Delhi, Mr. Kenneth Brill, have pointed out, there is more to Indo-U.S. relations than just Pakistan and the linked issues of Kashmir and human rights. If New Delhi chooses to look at Indo-U.S. ties merely through Pakistan-Kashmir prism it will only hurt itself.

As far as the United States is concerned India could only benefit from continuously intensifying its economic and trade relations. This is something the United States too appears keen on. The United States is sending a high level trade delegation led by the commerce secretary, Mr. Ron Brown, in August. The effort should be to use such opportunities to expand Indo-U.S. contacts in other spheres, rather than allow Pakistan or Kashmir to overshadow all aspects of bilateral ties.

* ICO Reproved for Pro-Pakistani 'Political Intrigues'

БК0203051394 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English
21 Feb 94 p 8

[Editorial: "Not Wanted in Kashmir"]

[Text] The offer of the Islamic Conference Organisation [ICO] to mediate in the Kashmir dispute is a cruel diplomatic joke which has been rightly spurned by New Delhi with the contempt it deserves. No other foreign body has given such solid and consistent support to Pakistan in setting the Kashmir valley virtually ablaze in the last four years as the ICO. What has suddenly made its Saudi-funded secretariat change its tune and posit itself as a peace-maker? The ICO Secretary-General, Dr Al Gabid, has a long record of indulging in anti-Indian propaganda at Pakistan's behest. It is he more than anyone else who has helped Pakistan manipulate the ICO to get anti-Indian resolutions passed at its meetings. He is again being true to his commitment to the cause of Pakistan in accusing India of grave human rights violations in Kashmir on the eve of the UN Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva. Yet, the ICO has the temerity to offer mediation. This is akin to Pakistan's own terrorist trainers posing as a detached party solely concerned with bringing peace and harmony to Kashmir.

It is possible that a few balanced members of the ICO are secretly not quite happy with the way Pakistan has misused the organisation for its own anti-Indian designs. Indeed some of them have individually sought to allay New Delhi's suspicions about their bonafides by claiming to have worked behind the scenes to moderate the anti-Indian resolutions introduced by Pakistan in the past. But even if this were true, the more important issue is that the ICO just has no locus standi in the Kashmir dispute. Its concern for alleged human rights violations is only a pretence. Apart from the fact that this is simply a ruse to play the Pakistani game, would it not be more relevant for ICO to confine its attention to large-scale human rights violations in the very Islamic countries it represents? After all, even Pakistan has been indicted by both its own human rights activists and foreign organisations.

The ICO's avowed interest in protecting human rights may have been a little more credible if it had routinely raised its voice against shocking cases of barbarism in the Islamic world. These include the use of poison gas against the Kurdish rebels in Iraq, air-raids on the

Kurdish minorities in both Iraq, and Iran and the unending agony of the Shia minority in the marshes of southern Iraq. At present, Afghanistan is easily the worst case of an entire country having become a virtual hell for its population. The ICO has done precious little to rectify matters. Has it bothered at least to mount a humanitarian effort on the requisite scale to send succour to the Afghans? Dr Al Gabid and his friends in the ICO secretariat are apparently far too busy in political intrigues in Geneva on behalf of Pakistan to devote time and energy to all trivial pursuits.

*** Editorial on Kashmir 'Big Game,' U.S. Role**

BK0403150194 Calcutta ANANDABAZAR PATRIKA
in Bengali 21 Feb 94 p 4

[Editorial: "Pulling the United States"]

[Text] There was a time when European rulers frequently used to refer to the phrase "the white man's burden." Those were the days of imperialism. By this burden they meant the black people of Africa and Asia. These colonial rulers considered themselves the guardian of the black people. It is true that these blacks were a cause of anxiety for their white masters. Although those days are gone, there is no reason to heave a sigh of relief. At present, the two neighboring countries in the Indian subcontinent, which have become engaged in a dispute over the Kashmir issue, are willing to accept the United States as a mediator to resolve the discord. This reminds us of the bygone days of imperialism. Benazir Bhutto is pulling one hand of President Clinton while the other is being pulled by Narasimha Rao. This is a matter of great delight for President Clinton as the United States wants to be the only protector of the world. What consolation or satisfaction does Islamabad or New Delhi gain by doing all this? What special gains do they expect by calling upon the United States to mediate their dispute? The finance committee chairman of the U.S. Senate and former U.S. ambassador to India, Daniel Patrick Moynihan, was told by Prime Minister Narasimha Rao that all bilateral disputes between India and Pakistan should be resolved in accordance with the Shimla Agreement. He also urged the United States compel Pakistan to sit down for a dialogue to resolve this issue. On the other hand, Pakistan is saying that the situation in Kashmir is gradually becoming explosive. It wants the United States to exert pressure upon India so that an early settlement is reached on this issue.

It must be said that a big game is being played with the Kashmir issue. If New Delhi wants to inform the world community about the involvement of Pakistan in the militancy in Kashmir, it should do this work properly and stop issuing contradictory statements. Otherwise, this country will have to face a lot of miseries. It should be admitted that Indian diplomacy has failed to deal properly with the Kashmir issue and Pakistan is taking advantage of this situation. Pakistan is using the United Nations and the Islamic Conference Organization to achieve their designs. It is also approaching anti-Indian officials in the U.S. administration and pleading for the protection of human rights in Kashmir. India has done the right thing by rejecting the offer given by the Islamic Conference Organization to

mediate in this issue. As Jammu and Kashmir is a state of India, the sovereignty of the country would have been violated had India accepted this proposal. It should also be realized by India that this is not the proper time to take a stubborn attitude on this issue. India should soften its stand and see whether the allegations of human rights violations is true or not. It would be wise to soften the Indian stand under international or U.S. pressure. There is nothing wrong in saying that India will not accept the illegal demands and evil designs of Pakistan. At the same time no one should be allowed to think that the attitude of India is self-contradictory.

*** Advani Calls for Restoration of Normalcy to Valley**

94AS0219A Varanasi AJ in Hindi 21 Feb 94 p 5

[Text] Jammu, 20 February (PR)—Lal Krishna Advani, president of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), told the Central Government and the Jammu-Kashmir government to get rid of the state's unsavory elements and give full freedom to the security forces to crush Pakistani-supported terrorism.

Mr. Advani, reading various reports from talks with several people, said that he has learned officials in the state government are, one way or another, encouraging terrorism in the state. He said that such disgraceful persons should be uprooted without haste. Mr. Advani was addressing a public meeting at the parade grounds.

Comparing the situation in the valley with Punjab, Mr. Advani said that the most important step needed to improve the situation in the valley is to give a free hand to officers in dealing with terrorism. He said that when such an arrangement was made in Punjab, the situation had improved rapidly. Additionally, the Central Government was watching Punjab closely during the terrorism era.

Mr. Advani said that the situation in Jammu-Kashmir is very different. Even the governor's mandate is not obeyed in the valley. The BJP leader told the Central Government that it should not hesitate to take strict action in Kashmir. Mr. Advani reminded his listeners that the Indian Government, despite international objections, had taken steps to test nuclear weapons in Sikkim, Goa, Hyderabad, and Pokhran. India has never bowed down to international pressures. Why, then, should it bow in the context of the valley?

*** Commentary Criticizes U.S. Stand on Kashmir**

94AS0219B Varanasi AJ in Hindi 21 Feb 94 p 6

[Commentary by Abhinav Kautilya: "Out of Line: The Issue is not Human Rights, but Clinton's Autocracy"]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] When people who dropped nuclear bombs on Hiroshima and played with the lives of millions of innocent women, the elderly, the handicapped, and the sick, and made the earth there unproductive forever, are now talking about human rights in Kashmir, then it appears we are not listening to a president [Clinton] but to a sick person suffering from mental illness in an asylum. India, in comparison with the way the Americans cut down the Vietnamese like vegetables and grass, is miles away from sinking to this level. Clinton has said that terrorism and religious fundamentalism is nothing; the real thing is human rights. [passage omitted]

What is happening in Kashmir? One or two thousand crazed Pakistanis are shouting and carrying weapons in their hands, telling us that they will decide where they will live. This really is something. We do not have to accept what hundreds of thousands of voters want or the wishes of those who elected representatives to Kashmir's Vidhan Sabha and the Indian Parliament. Instead, we should listen to the people fighting a guerrilla war with weapons from Pakistan and the United States of America. The United States wants us to honor and pamper them.

The depth to which Mr. Clinton wants us to go down in relation to human rights is the same as we wish to follow. It is true that human rights belong to humans, but who are humans? Only those who follow truth, religion, non-violence, and are of good character and high ideals are humans. This is the old, accepted standard. Now we say generally that any person who believes in law and order is human. Anyone who is not human is a devil. If we ignore the old definition, then whoever ignores law and order is a non-citizen or inhuman. We can also say that person is a criminal. From this perspective, U.S. President Clinton is advocating the position of criminals in Kashmir. [passage omitted]

Human rights have not been defined by the United States, but by the United Nations. No other member of the United Nations has noticed any human rights violations; only the United States has. Now it seems that God has given all intelligence and vision only to Bill Clinton. It seems that Clinton is not only the President of the United States, but the greatest autocrat in the world. [passage omitted]

*** Openness Urged in Diplomatic War Over Kashmir**

94AS0222B Jalandhar PUNJAB KESARI in Hindi
22 Feb 94 p 6

[Article by Punam I. Kaushish: "Openness Has Begun To Be Effective as a Weapon Against Militants in Kashmir"]

[Text] In the poker game there is a time when the players have to cash in their coupons. Narasimha Rao is doing the same thing in the context of Kashmir. Recently four European diplomats visited Jammu-Kashmir. This has

brought forward a new policy that the policy-makers in the South Block have now adopted.

This transparent operation is important for two reasons. First, it shows clearly that India is open and does not hide anything. Second, the clear picture has emerged to the Western nations and they understand the situation better. At the same time the complications in the Kashmir issue will be brought to light. It is hoped that the Indian situation will be strengthened by it, because the main problem in Kashmir is the Pakistan-induced rebellion, and it will become fully clear.

It is to the Indian government's credit that it did not hesitate in giving permission to the European ambassadors to come to India and visit Kashmir so that they can talk directly with the people there. This way, India has proved itself to be a progressive democracy. At the same time, it has shown its serious intent to resolve the Kashmir situation within the framework of Indian Constitution.

We hope that this visit will open the eyes of Western nations to the fact that India is not at fault. Fortunately, those diplomats who toured the crisis-ridden state supported what India has been saying.

This was glimpsed in the changed attitude towards the Pakistani resolution in the Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva. No doubt, Benazir Bhutto is trying to play the human rights card which Bill Clinton and his Western allies are trying to support. Still, this human rights issue is not making much progress. Some reports indicate that these countries have warned about the Islamabad resolution and have said that this will further deteriorate India-Pakistan relations and aggravate the tense situation in southeast Asia.

It is good for New Delhi that these diplomats have reacted positively. It is not known what their report sent to the European Union says. However, the talk in the diplomatic circles in New Delhi hints that this will strengthen India's position.

They talked with various people in the state and it helped India's side. They also learned how the Indian government and the state government officials have been struggling with this serious situation. They have come to the conclusion that, except for some unfortunate aspects, the Kashmir issue from the Indian perspective has not reached a point from where there is no turning back. No doubt, they have returned with the impression that the people in the valley are tired of the terrorists and desire return to normalcy.

There is another and more important facet. They have begun to feel that this situation would not have been created if external powers had not interfered in Kashmir. In other words, they have gotten proof of another Pakistani war against India. In this context, three of the four diplomats congratulated General Krishna Rao and his

administration. They said, "Everyone we met praised General Rao and his efforts. No one said anything negative."

They have returned with the impression that the army, the Border Security Force, the Central Reserve Police Force, and the local police that are stationed there do not have appropriate training for dealing with terrorists. They were impressed that the authorities did not deny that some extreme actions were taken. They were also provided information about all the cases involving extreme activities about what action was taken in such cases.

There is no denying that these extreme actions started on the other side of the border. India tried to deal with the problem after that. In this chain of events the security forces broke rules. Still, it is clear that India did not take the initiative; it followed the policy of dealing with the other side's initiative.

It is also true that Pakistani fundamentalists attacked Indian security forces. The Indian troops acted in retaliation and Pakistan made a mountain of a mole hill. Still, it was a smart Pakistani political move to support terrorism on a large scale and keep it hidden from the world.

More than 300,000 Kashmiri Pandits are living as refugees in various corners of the country. They have suffered a lot. The diplomats received proof of it through their meeting with Kashmiri Pandits and the Muslims living in Jammu. The Western nations should not have any problem in understanding this situation because a similar situation exists in Bosnia.

The truth is that if India wanted to hide facts, it would not have permitted the diplomats to visit Jammu-Kashmir and given them a free hand. They met all those they wanted to meet. They visited the Hazratbal shrine and hospitals, and talked with the leaders of Huriat Conference for two hours. Despite the Pakistani propaganda, they went there on their own without any security forces with them. For example, a taxi was parked outside Hazratbal which took the four of them to meet the Huriat leaders.

They saw Pakistanis and Afghans in the hospital that the security forces have arrested. The diplomats said that those people were not invented by India.

When they were talking with some people in Hazratbal, only then did they hear the demand for freedom. About 100 people had gathered there and the number rose to 500 later. The Huriat leaders demanded a referendum according to the UN resolution. No one said that they wanted to join Pakistan or want to live independently. Their demand was: the right to self-determination.

Almost everyone expressed respect for Dr. Karan Singh. No one said anything positive about Farooq Abdullah. It appeared that nobody likes him.

There could not have been a better time for this visit because the Americans had adopted an anti-India attitude at that time. Now it is clear that we can respond to

the propaganda that Pakistan was spreading about human rights violations to which President Clinton was putting his seal of approval without thinking.

The Americans have never considered this problem to be of an insurgence induced by terrorism. Perhaps they thought that if they admit this, then Pakistan's role in Kashmir and Punjab would be exposed. The fact is that Washington refuses to understand the complexities of this issue. Instead, it views the situation as though Indian troops occupying the valley were spreading a civil war there. Meanwhile, Islamabad is depending on its Muslim brothers.

The Pakistani politicians have used the human rights approach to realize their ambitions. The truth is that such violations have occurred in their country and they are looking the other way. Islamabad has accepted the figures on Kashmir that Amnesty International has given, however, it is looking away from the figures about Pakistan that this organization has compiled. This organization has clearly written about Pakistan that tortures and rapes were committed by the police and other forces on people in their custody and that it happens in many places in Pakistan.

Even the chairman of Pakistan's own human rights group has listed many incidents of torture in Pakistan. For example, 95 incidents of violence against political activists in police custody and 55 incidents of rapes of innocent women and children were cited by this group. These figures are for the last two months. Most of these incidents took place in Sindh, Benazir Bhutto's home province.

Argentina's organization, the World Movement of Restoration of Human Rights, has also condemned incidents of human rights violation in Pakistan. The Kashmir Democratic Forum is an organization of progressive Muslims in Switzerland. It also has condemned Pakistan. This organization told Benazir Bhutto to leave Kashmir to the Kashmiris, because her interference is causing innumerable problems for the Kashmiris.

The U.S. State Department report is also very strong. It has hinted about unethical killing usually shown as confrontation with the police. Many incidents of misuse of police officers are noted and corruption is increasing. The police and the jailers use force to make people say whatever they want to hear. Innocent people are beaten and all kind of atrocities are committed. This is the story of Pakistani jails where people die and commit suicide.

Pakistan is still going on with its propaganda war against India while committing these sins. The European diplomats have seen that. New Delhi is going to focus on the Islamic world now. It is going to invite the diplomats from Islamic countries. They will tour the valley and see what drama Pakistan has staged there.

There will be one major benefit from it. The shroud of secrecy over the valley will be lifted and Pakistan's lies will be exposed. After all, this problem should be resolved by working together. The Indian prime minister has adopted the right attitude about it with a lot of thought, balance, and creativity behind it. Now the idea of just holding talks with Islamabad has been dropped. No doubt New Delhi wants to normalize and improve its relations with its neighbors, however, there must be an appropriate environment for that. The issues on which we have serious differences can be left for a later date. This is the right attitude and will serve the interests of both nations. Narasimha Rao himself had shed light on it. The time has come now for the international community to stop looking for faults, and try to find truth.

*** Nation Said United Against U.S. Kashmir Policy**

94AS0212K Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English
22 Feb 94 p 8

[Article by Nikhil Chakravarty: "Unity in Militancy"]

[Text] An important development in the handling of foreign policy has practically gone unnoticed—at least has not been commented upon as much as it deserved.

This is the induction of the leader of the opposition in Parliament as the head of the Indian delegation to the current session of the United Nations human rights commission in Geneva. Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee spoke at the Geneva meeting not as a partisan leader but as the accredited representative of the government and the public of this country.

It signifies there is a remarkable unity within the country on the Kashmir issue as it stands today. But more important is the Indian reaction to the exploitation of the Kashmir issue in the strategic game of the big power. On the face of it, this unity in approach is a Christmas gift from Mr. Bill Clinton and his administration. Mr. John Mallot, Ms. Robin Raphel and Mr. Clinton have spoken so volubly on Kashmir that even the most obsequious among Washington's friends in India find it difficult to accept the Clinton administration's attitude to India on the Kashmir issue.

Criticism has not been confined to charges of human rights violation by India's security forces in the Kashmir valley. The U.S. administration has called into question the accession of Jammu and Kashmir to India and tried to brand it as a civil war on the lines of Afghanistan.

No criticism has been levelled against Pakistan's support, both material and political, to the militants in the valley demanding secession from the Indian Union. It is this blatant abetment of armed secessionism that has now made New Delhi aware of the basics of U.S. policy and helped to bring about a degree of unity within the country.

The assumption on which New Delhi was working until last year was that after the Cold War, there would be a

realisation on the part of Washington on the need to accept India as the more durable and reliable entity in south Asia.

It was also assumed Pakistan's geostrategic importance in the region had gone down with the disappearance of the Soviet Union.

For one thing, the huge, complex democracy that India happens to be is too difficult to manage and manipulate for any power however formidable it may claim to be. Even the opening up of the economy by the Indian authorities at the specific behest of the International Monetary Fund-World Bank bosses sitting in Washington does not provide that insurance for the policy makers in the state department and the Pentagon.

Second, Pakistan's importance to the Pentagon has been reinforced by the emergence of a whole cluster of central Asian republics rich in mineral wealth. Also the two sensitive zones of the Chinese strategic defence, namely, Tibet and Sinkiang are contiguous to Pakistan and Kashmir as well.

As the entire drama of resumption of an elected regime unfolded in Pakistan, it was clear the authority of the military junta has not really been liquidated. It has assumed a fresh significance in a changed context.

It is in this context one felt the repeated implorings by New Delhi with Washington to declare Pakistan a terrorist state was both unreal and pathetic—rather demeaning to the self-respect of the country.

It is good to notice the Indian representative rebuffed the offer of third party mediation in Kashmir by the Organisation of Islamic Countries [OIC]. The OIC has long declared its support for the secessionists in the Kashmir valley.

The key to the settlement of the Kashmir crisis lies in the hands of the government and leaders of political parties. They have to take the initiative in talking to the militant groups and their fellow travellers in the Kashmir valley. They should arrange a round table in which all the concerned parties—including most certainly the representatives of the Pandits who constitute a significant entity in the Kashmir valley—are invited.

Incidentally, it was a welcome move on the part of the Pandit community to place its case before the Geneva meeting. This move makes it abundantly clear the alleged violations of human rights in the Kashmir valley do not go along the Hindu-Muslim communal divide.

For long, the Indian stand has been that Kashmir is an internal matter for India. The reality has been this is true in parts. The international aspect of the Kashmir question is related to India having taken the Pakistani armed attack on Kashmir on the very morrow of independence to the UN.

No doubt this aspect of the question has to be tackled at the international level and cannot be wished away.

If the burden of New Delhi's case is that all the trouble in Kashmir is due to Pakistan encouraging the militants, then it will be giving in to Islamabad's strident clamour for internationalising the Kashmir question. It is therefore all the more imperative the Indian leadership takes a bold initiative to open dialogue with the militants, treating them as fellow citizens however embittered they may be.

It is time the statesmanship displayed by the prime minister in unifying Indian opinion for a common stand on Pakistan's diplomatic offensive on Kashmir was projected at home. This way a common approach towards the Kashmiri people, however intractable the militants among them might be at the moment, can be forged.

*** Article says U.S. 'Soft' on Pakistan View of Kashmir**

BK0303023894 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English
23 Feb 94 p 8

[Article by Bharat Bhushan: "Divergent Discourses"]

[Excerpt] Several recent U.S. actions have created an impression but not only is America not keen on improving relations with India, but that it seeks to play a partisan role on sensitive issues such as Kashmir. Levels of mutual suspicion are high, stray foreign policy pronouncements are magnified and the arena of diplomatic discourse appear to be shrinking.

Missives from the White House and an apparent softness towards state sponsorship of terrorism by Pakistan make it difficult to take Washington's claim of being even-handed in South Asia at face value. There are other indications, although by no means definitive as yet, that the U.S. may be getting into a special relationship with Pakistan.

It is not known what kind of sop was offered to Pakistan when the U.S. persuaded it to withdraw the resolution on Kashmir in the UN General Assembly last year. If it was the withdrawal of the Pressler Amendment, as some observers believe, then clearly the U.S. has not been able to deliver. It remains to be seen where the US stands on Pakistan's resolution on Kashmir at the meeting of the UN Commission on Human Rights at Geneva later this month.

Pakistan seems adamant on moving the resolution to embarrass India. But it could be embarrassing for the U.S. also, if it were forced to abstain from voting on an issue apparently concerning human rights. If the U.S. persuades Pakistan to desist once again, then it will not be without Pakistan extracting a price. If, however, the U.S. votes with Pakistan, it can kiss goodbye to any hope of improving ties with India.

For the time being, it appears that Indo-U.S. relations are being impelled by the momentum of daily reactions and counter-reactions to stray signals from Washington. While the Indian establishment seems to have been

hijacked by media reaction, the Americans have become prisoners of their own verbiage on human rights.

It is unrealistic to expect that a Democratic administration would give up its public stance on human rights in Kashmir especially when abuses continue to occur. But there are severe problems with the way this administration views Kashmir and its attempts at engaging India on human rights issues to the exclusion of other aspects of Indo-U.S. relations.

For a start, arms of the U.S. foreign policy establishment are yet to understand the difference between annexation and accession when it comes to Kashmir, e.g. the U.S. Central Command Chief General Joseph P. Hoar's comments on how India "annexed" Kashmir in 1947. The Americans talk breathlessly about taking the opinion of the "Kashmiri people" into account. But Pakistan has changed the demographic profile of the area occupied by it since 1947 to such an extent, that donkeys would decide about the future of horses if there were anything akin to a plebiscite.

The U.S. also does not understand the consequences for the rest of India if Kashmir were to become independent. Given the existence of a large and scattered Muslim population, there could be a thousand Bosnias in India itself. Happenings in Europe and Central Asia should be warning enough against a blind faith in self-determination for nationalities.

Kashmir and nuclear proliferation are no doubt important issues and must engage the attention of India. But day-to-day provocations have meant that the U.S. is either deliberately or by default letting Pakistan set the agenda for Indo-U.S. relations. On its part, India has also failed to project its foreign policy agenda in the U.S. beyond these issues. This either shows a lack of understanding of Washington or an inability to orchestrate its various arms.

The U.S. foreign policy establishment is not a monolithic self-conscious entity. U.S. foreign policy is formed through a multiplicity of discourses. The range cannot be covered adequately by the blanket term "American point of view". The State Department, Commerce Department, Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, Pentagon, White House and Congress all have a say in foreign policy formulation. In addition, U.S. foreign policy is also influenced by powerful business lobbies, think-tanks and special interest groups including NGOs [Nongovernmental Organizations]. [passage omitted]

India is not very high in the priority list of the U.S. It hardly receives any aid and private investment is not coming to India out of charity. Nor is there any prospect of GIs landing in Kashmir at any future date. Indian diplomacy, inasmuch as there is a need to carry on an economic and political relationship, can attempt to work around the drum-beaters of Clinton's global agenda instead of hoping for a good chit from the U.S. like an eager schoolboy.

*** Commentary Applauds Parliament's 'Warning' to Pakistan**

BK2302080294 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 0245 GMT 23 Feb 94

[Commentary by S.C. Bhatt]

[Text] So long, the security forces have borne the brunt of the low-cost proxy war that Pakistan has been waging in Kashmir. They have shown exemplary patience and restraint in dealing with criminal elements trained, armed, and funded by Pakistan. Unfair and false accusations have been flung at them. The tragedy overall was that some elements in our own country were oblivious of the tremendous burden on the security men and were willing to be taken in by the untruthful propaganda. Now the answer to Pakistan and its supporters has come from the august Parliament of India.

Both houses have adopted with unanimity a resolution warning Pakistan against aiding and abetting the terrorists in Kashmir. The people's representatives have demonstrated that India stands completely united as one man on preserving her integrity. The Parliament has also shown that when the time comes democracy can prove stronger than the plutocracy that our neighbor seems to have and stronger than any other form of government. We may have our differences on many issues. Different parties have different views on how and when the political process in Kashmir should be restarted. Differences persist on who would be the best persons to run the state in the meanwhile. But on the integrity of the nation, on Kashmir being an inalienable part of India and the need to drive out the terrorists sent from across the border, there are no two opinions.

One wishes this warning to Pakistan had come somewhat earlier, but it has been satisfying to note that lately there has been the much desired clarity and firmness of resolve in the government's utterances and actions. The government seems to have grasped the meaning of the disturbing statements emanating from Washington which have given some strength to Pakistan's reckless actions in Kashmir. In a way, therefore, Parliament's resolution is a warning to both Islamabad and the United States.

By a fortuitous and fortunate coincidence, the European ambassadors who recently toured Kashmir also spoke through a representative on the issue of terrorism in Kashmir. Their evaluation is of importance because they had complete freedom to observe whatever they felt they should see to form an opinion. They have found evidence of the terrorists, including foreign mercenaries, operating in strength. They also saw that the people are fed up with the prolonged militancy supported by Pakistan. India has also to be vigilant against any excesses and ensure that the people in Kashmir are protected and not allowed to come to harm. The voice of the people of India expressed by Parliament must serve as a strong warning to both the perpetrator of the armed intrusions and its long distanced supporter. *

BJP Supports Government Resolution on Kashmir

94AS0221A Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English 23 Feb 94 p 1

[Article by Pranay Sharma: "BJP Bails Out Government on Jammu-Kashmir Resolution"]

[Text] New Delhi, Feb. 22—The Centre today sought the BJP's [Bharatiya Janata Party] help in getting the all-party resolution on Kashmir passed in Parliament unanimously.

Sensing the National Front-Left combine's resolve not to support the resolution unless the United States was named in it, the ruling party sought the BJP's help in convincing recalcitrant parties to give up their demand.

It was also agreed that since most parties had differed on how the Kashmir tangle should be handled, the proposed debate on the strife-torn state will be held later.

The strongly-worded resolution, passed by both Houses of Parliament this afternoon, focused its attack mainly on Pakistan. Though there are oblique references to the Clinton Administration for its support to Pakistan, it has not been named. The resolution says: "Any attempt from any quarter to interfere in the internal affairs of India will be met resolutely."

Sources said after yesterday's abortive attempt to convince the NF-Left combine not to insist on naming the United States in the resolution, the Speaker convened another meeting this morning in his Parliament chamber.

The leader of the Opposition and senior BJP member, Mr. Atal Behari Vajpayee, along with Left party leaders, Mr. Indrajit Gupta, Mr. Chitta Basu and Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhury, were present at the meeting. The Union home minister, Mr. S.B. Chavan, and the parliamentary affairs minister, Mr. V.C. Shukla, were representing the government.

Both Mr. Chavan and Mr. Shukla made it clear to Opposition leaders that the government was in no position to name the United States in the resolution. But Left party leaders stuck to their stand and argued that the Clinton government had been encouraging Pakistan by questioning not only India's human rights records in Kashmir but also its territorial integrity. Hence, without naming the United States, the resolution on Kashmir would be meaningless.

But Mr. Vajpayee convinced the dissenting parties to agree to what the government was saying and not to question the wording of the resolution since its main objective was to convey a clear message to the world that Indian political parties, despite their differences, were firmly behind the government when its territorial integrity was at stake.

He insisted that the main thrust of the resolution was to isolate Pakistan. "Instead of doing that should we waste

time arguing whether the United States should also be named in the resolution?" He warned if Parliament failed to get the resolution passed unanimously it would only help Pakistan's gameplan and prove that even on such a vital issue, the Indian people were divided.

This did the trick and Left leaders gave up their obstinate stand and decided not to insist on naming the United States. Mr. Chitta Basu said: "The argument put forward by Mr. Vajpayee convinced us and we decided not to press for naming the United States. We too felt that it is more important to get the resolution passed unanimously than exposing our differences."

Despite the Left's decision to go along with the resolution, the CPI(M) [Communist Party of India-Marxist] general secretary, Mr. Harkishen Singh Surjeet, in a statement hit out at the government for failing to mention the United States in its Kashmir resolution. The statement said: "The resolution has failed to nail down the Clinton Administration which, under the guise of protecting human rights, is encouraging such activities for establishing its hegemony."

Later, all members of Parliament, cut across the party lines in decrying Pakistan's continued support of terrorism in Kashmir. The resolution, moved in the Lok Sabha by the Speaker, Mr. Shivraj Patil, and in the Rajya Sabha by the Chairman, Mr. K.R. Narayanan, firmly said India had the capacity to counter all designs against its unity and integrity.

*** Paper Applauds Parliament's Affirmation on Kashmir**

BK0303032494 Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English
24 Feb 94 p 8

[Editorial: "Ground Rules of Encounter"]

[Text] To suggest that the historic show of unanimity in Parliament on Tuesday over Kashmir is a clear demonstration of national resolve would be tantamount to stating the obvious. In effect, the resolution achieves much more. The categorical affirmation that Jammu and Kashmir [J&K] "has been, is and shall be an integral part of India" and that "all attempts to interfere in the internal affairs of India will be met resolutely" establishes the bottom line of the country's position on the subject. After this resolution, it is beyond the scope of any government, present or future, to flirt with outrageous proposals aimed at eroding national sovereignty in J&K. It puts paid to both sinister and well-meaning "self-determination" projects and imposes a parliamentary veto on all attempts to redraw the map of India. Equally, it signals to separatists throughout the country that the territorial frontiers of India are non-negotiable and that demands for "autonomy" have to be articulated keeping this position in mind. Regardless of other internal arrangements, the national tricolour must fly from Kashmir to Kanyakumari.

Although the timing of the resolution was dictated by extraneous considerations, notably Pakistan's spirited bid to complete the "unfinished agenda" of partition and Washington's helping hand to Islamic terrorism, the resolution is calculated to have a salutary effect on the country's own morale. For the defence personnel engaged in the difficult and, sometimes, thankless job of fighting the insurgents, the resolution is reassurance that some cynical politicians will not barter away their sacrifices. For the dispossessed citizens of the Kashmir valley—both Hindu and Muslim languishing forgotten in refugee camps there is at least a glimmer of hope that the will return to their homes one day. And ordinary citizens can delight in the realisation that no responsible person—at least not yet—can hope to remain in public life without acknowledging the emotive strength of Indian nationalism. Tuesday's resolution has established the parameter of national debate and international opinion will, in time, pay due heed to it. The collective echo of some 880 million cannot, after all, be treated as a casual refrain

There will, of course, be the dissenting voices and these are likely to be highlighted by the pathological India-haters, not least in international fora. But after this show of national solidarity, the private agendas of "Track-II" diplomacy will no longer be able to masquerade as representative Indian opinion. The capitulationists should be certainly listened to, but with the same degree of seriousness reserved for the lunatic fringe in democracies. Parliament has clearly set out the ground rules for coping with this ferocious assault on Indian nationhood; the onus is now on the Government to ensure it is translated into practice. The nation has shown the will and the Government must evolve a way.

***Panun Kashmir Highlights Government Neglect of Hindus**

94AS0221B New Delhi INDIAN EXPRESS in English
25 Feb 94 p 8

[Text] Bombay—In protest against human rights violations "Panun Kashmir," an organization to protect the interests of Kashmir Pandits, organized a street play, "Sab Theek Thak Hai" (everything is alright).

The play, which coincided with the human rights week observed all over the country and abroad by "Panun Kashmir" (our own Kashmir), is a satire depicting the ongoing terrorism in the Valley and the government's lackadaisical attitude toward the issue.

Various representatives of the organization have told the United Nations Human Rights Commission in Geneva that New Delhi has "violated their rights, choosing instead to appease Islamic fundamentalist forces" in their state, resulting in the "growth of secular and democratic forces."

"For the first time we have exposed the designs of our state and the government's apathy. We have attacked

both Farooq Abdullah and Congress Party. Our artistes will project the facts," said the organization convenor Agnishekhar.

"Our nation is on the verge of disintegration and Kashmir is the litmus test. If we lose Kashmir then it will be difficult for us to stay united," he added.

Disillusioned with the Bharatiya Janata Party's role, Agnishekhar said that even they reduced the Kashmir issue to a "mere simple argument."

Agnishekhar said more than 5,000 members of the community have died in camps and elsewhere due to sunstrokes, gastro enteritis, typhoid epidemics, snake bites, etc., following their forced exodus from the Valley.

According to the organization, about 300,000 Kashmir Pandits, constituting 99 percent of the total population of Hindus living in Muslim majority areas of the Valley were forcibly pushed out by the terrorists, who were trained in Pakistan since 1989. "There is a threat of extinction. Death rate is increasing, while the birth rate has fallen drastically in Kashmir," said Agnishekhar.

Elaborating upon the destruction in Jammu and Kashmir, the organization members said about 1,100 Kashmir Pandits were tortured and killed by the terrorists; 105 educational institutions were damaged or forcibly occupied; 103 religious and cultural institutions were destroyed; 14,430 business houses were destabilized and 95 percent of the houses were looted.

*** Government Seen Downplaying Spread of Violence To Jammu**

94AS0219G New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 25 Feb 94
p 4

[Editorial: "Jammu's Explosion"]

[Text] The explosions that occurred in Jammu cannot be dismissed as simple incidents of terrorism. Government spokesmen and political leaders became silent after calling these blasts cowardly acts and announcing financial relief to those who were killed or wounded. The police will go through the formality of announcing an additional increase in security. Yet this has happened again and again. Governor General Krishna Rao has appealed to the people not to be deceived by the terrorists, who want only to increase communal tensions. Does the governor hope that when there are bomb blasts in a busy market that remind them of the blasts in Bombay, when people are killed or hurt and there is great bedlam in the market, that people will not get angry and demonstrate against the government and the police? If this was the case, then we would suspect that the apathy of the people in Jammu had reached its extreme, and that even the most serious incident cannot affect them. The Kashmir government should be thankful to the people that it was the police on which the angry youths focused their outrage and not on a specific group. But it is also important to understand that if more of these incidents

occurred, it would be very difficult to remain calm. Therefore, the Jammu-Kashmir government should correct the problems in its police administration. The armed terrorist organizations in the Kashmir valley have gotten the support of the people in special circumstances. They have succeeded in establishing a reign of terror in the valley. If they succeed in doing the same thing in Jammu, though, it would be very difficult to fight the resulting anarchy. The entire administrative machinery of Jammu-Kashmir is ineffective, because the government is unable to get proper information about anti-national and terrorist activities. Therefore, after every incident, they make statements in a hurry, they seem to have no other alternative.

It is surprising because the government knew that due to the powerful campaign by Pakistan, there would be increased terrorist activity. Because of the increased security in the valley and in Doda, it was natural for the terrorists to attack the softer, easier targets in Jammu. Pakistan wants to show that the control of the Indian government in Jammu-Kashmir has ended, and that the whole state has rebelled. The Pakistan supporters argued in Geneva that it is not the Pakistani terrorists, but the local people in Kashmir, that are fighting the war for independence. The Jammu bomb blasts, therefore, should be seen in this context. All members of Parliament have declared Jammu-Kashmir an integral part of India and have repeated their determination to free the part of Kashmir currently under Pakistan's control. The central home minister is planning to accelerate economic development processes in Kashmir. However, all these promises will be on paper until they are implemented and an honest, effective police and administration are established in the state. The fact is that the Kashmir problem was created by poor government administration. Therefore, if the Indian government wants to give a proper and effective response to Pakistan's anti-India tirade, then it should dispose of the other political biases and start overhauling the administration in Jammu-Kashmir. The political party will benefit from this strategy because, in the present situation, no politics can be practiced there. The national determination expressed in Parliament should also be applied to the formation of an effective national strategy.

*** Hindu Voice Raised, Justice Sought**

94AS0219E Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES in Hindi
25 Feb 94 p 3

[Commentary: "Why Is the Hindu Suffering Not Noticed?"]

[Text] Bombay, 24 February (NP)—It is surprising that truth-loving truth President Clinton has compared the Kashmir situation with Bosnia. According to him, the human rights of Muslims are being violated in Kashmir. His advisors are apparently giving him inaccurate reports. The fact is that Pakistani terrorists are destroying democracy in Kashmir and are committing horrible atrocities against Hindus to establish an Islamic

feudal government. Even Hitler did not commit such atrocities against the Jews. The truth is that Hindus are being totally obliterated in Kashmir.

When the terrorists take hold of an Indian soldier, they take out his eyes, amputate his hands, feet, nose, and ears, and leave him to die. Some Indian soldiers acted in retaliation. If such atrocities were committed against U. S. soldiers, would the U.S. President remain quiet in the name of human rights?

Mr. Clinton should help the world's largest democracy and peace-loving country, India, stop terrorism instead of helping a country that is increasing terrorism and the drug trade all over the world.

It is important to let Mr. Clinton know that after independence, India appointed a Muslim president, governors, and chief ministers. Pakistan and Bangladesh, however, have not even given Hindus the right to vote. They are not even permitted to worship. Their democratic and human rights are being violated. In India, we grant special privileges to Muslims, which the Hindus here do not have. We have passed minority protection laws. In order to help Muslims get education and employment, the government is sending millions of rupees. The Shankaracharya of Shringeri said in an interview that it is the blood of Hindus that runs in the veins of Muslims. The Indian Government spent about 750 billion rupees on the Kashmiri people over the last 45 years. Because of the hundreds of privileges, the population of Muslims in India has increased from 30 million to 120 million since independence. In Pakistan, however, because of the atrocious rule there, the number of Hindus has fallen from 10 million to only 1 million. Hindus are also disappearing from Kashmir and Bangladesh. Such genocide has never happened anywhere else in the world. The Hindu society, because of its love for peace and tolerance, has suffered atrocities for thousands of years.

In this context, we are appealing to the president of the most powerful country in the world to take the initiative of protecting India, which has done so much work to increase peace and spirituality in the world.

Former U. S. Presidents Kennedy and Carter understood this very well. In order to stop terrorism in Kashmir, the whole world will have to speak out against it. Therefore, we are requesting that the Pope and Mother Teresa speak against it, so that truth and non-violence will win.

*** Panun Kashmiri Pandits Say Government Vacillating**

94AS0219D Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES in Hindi
25 Feb 94 p 3

[Commentary: "The Center has Lost its Credibility by Changing Positions on the Kashmir Issue in International Forums"]

[Text] Bombay, 24 February (NP)—Panun Kashmir, the organization of Kashmiri pandits, says that the government of India, in changing its stand on the Kashmir issue repeatedly, has lost credibility at the international level. The position of our government has been weakened ethically.

Dr. Ajay Charungoo, spokesman for Panun Kashmir, told reporters today that the government is beginning to blame Islamic fundamentalism for the Kashmir problem. Before, the government blamed Pakistan's internal policy and drug smugglers for the problem.

Dr. Chrungoo returned on Monday after taking part in the human rights meeting in Geneva. In addition, Mr. Moti Kaul, president of the Kashmiri Pandit Association's Bombay branch, and Dr. Vijay Sazawal, president of the Indo-U. S. Kashmir Forum, participated as representatives of Panun Kashmir at the conference.

The Panun Kashmir spokesman said that the Indian government accused Pakistan of spreading unrest all over the country. It claimed to have proof of this. Why does not it sever diplomatic relations with such a country? The organization said that there is no sense in asking the United States to declare Pakistan a terrorist nation. According to the spokesman, this task should be done by the government of India.

Dr. Ajay Chrungoo said that the government had not explained the Kashmiri pandits' situation to other countries; that is why Western nations have learned only of Pakistan's side. He said he was doing the government's job. According to him, the government is giving too much importance to Asia Watch and Amnesty International. There are other human rights organizations; however, the government does not invite them.

Panun Kashmir has blamed all parties, including the BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party], for the Kashmir problem. The spokesman said that the BJP should handle the Kashmir problem by rising above Article 370. He said that leaders like Vajpayee and Jaswant Singh are sitting on the same platform with the National Conference leaders, while the stand of the conference is clear. They want autonomy for Kashmir.

*** Islamic World Said Divided Over Kashmir Response**

94AS0219C Bombay NAVBHARAT TIMES in Hindi
25 Feb 94 p 6

[Unattributed article: "Kashmir: Islamic Consensus Not With Pakistan"]

[Text] Geneva, 24 February (NPT)—Mr. Salman Khurshed, India's minister of external affairs, claims that the Islamic Conference countries understand India's stand on Kashmir, and that not all of its member nations are expected to vote in support of Pakistan.

Although Pakistan is trying to dye the Kashmir issue in Islamic colors, Mr. Khursheed was successful in getting the attention of the secretary general of the Conference by pointing out that after Indonesia, India has the largest Muslim population in the world, and that the votes of the Conference members in support of this resolution will affect the Indian Muslims.

India is discussing three concerns with members of the Human Rights Commission. One is that this controversial resolution will increase terrorism in Kashmir and would curb the progress of human rights protection efforts. The second is that voting in support or remaining absent during the vote will affect bilateral relations. Third, support of this resolution will directly affect India-Pakistan relations.

Mr. Khursheed met with representatives of several countries over the last three days and said that not participating in voting would be against the basic principles of human rights and would increase Pakistan's role in terrorism.

He said that the proposed resolution is being viewed in the framework of human rights in different parts of the world.

Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee, the opposition leader in the Lok Sabha who had also gone to take part in the conference, has insisted that member nations not be absent during the Pakistan resolution vote. He said that all nations friendly to India should vote against the resolution.

He told newsmen that the question was not one of human rights violations in Kashmir, but of Pakistan's support for terrorism in Kashmir, and that every country should oppose this.

*** London Said Becoming Center of Kashmiri Separatism**

94AS0212D Bombay THE TIMES OF INDIA
in English 25 Feb 94 p 23

[Text] London—Britain has become an important center for political lobbying as well as fund-raising for an anti-India campaign on Kashmir, even though earlier acts of terrorism, aimed against Indian targets here, have not been repeated in recent years.

The British Muslim youth is being radicalized by several organizations whose agenda includes a Jihad against disbelievers in many countries. They receive funds from abroad and, in Britain, seek to capture the control and management of mosques. Western counter-terrorism experts say that the past five years have seen an explosion in the number of Muslim charities, not dedicated to purely humanitarian aims.

The Kashmir connection of two of these organizations has been disclosed in a report in THE GUARDIAN

entitled, "The Young Muslims" and "Islamic Foundation" headed by Prof Kurshid Ahmed, known in Pakistan as the vice-president of Jamaat Islami, which has connections with extremists parties in Afghanistan and Kashmir.

The Islamic Foundation gave nearly 90,000 pounds sterling to a fund for Kashmir, according to the last published accounts in 1990. Details of the expenditure were not given. Britain now has a law to curb the flow of charity money for terrorist activities abroad but its enforcement is not that easy. Jammatt activists were said to be behind the original burning of Salman Rushdie's book in Bradford.

At the political level, some British politicians take an unusual interest in the Kashmir problem even though currently they are all critical of the meddling by American politicians on the issue of Northern Ireland. These MPs [members of Parliament] are not even of Kashmiri origin but are guided by the anti-Indian lobbies active in their constituencies.

Recently, both the Indian community as well as the Indian high commission intensified their efforts to present India's case on Kashmir with some notable results reflected in the last debate on the issue in the House of Lords. The Pakistani lobby has been able to enlist the services of a couple of academics also. At one time, very little reference material was circulated by the Indian side on the Kashmir issue among the political and media circles. The high commission has now circulated a series of backgrounders and brought out a compilation of articles on Kashmir in a book form.

The task of the Indian lobby is growing while it is not certain whether the British government will extend the same cooperation to India in checking Kashmiri extremism as it did in the case of Sikh extremism in Britain. The attempts to mobilize British Muslims for holy wars in foreign lands are a wider issue because these also take the form of anti-semitic propaganda and an assault on multi-culturalism. The new fervor has a distinct West-Asian flavor. The active groups are funded from outside Britain.

It is the point about outside funding that has become an additional irritant in the current controversy over the plans to establish a Hindu temple in Southall. The dispute involving the local council has divided the Asian community in the area on a religious basis. The controversy on buying a disused townhall continues to rage and the extent of bitterness about a provocative advertisement in a Pakistani newspaper here was revealed in a long phone-in program run by an ethnic radio station.

That a mosque can become a center of political program has been highlighted by THE GUARDIAN report which says that some of the literature being distributed by Islamic groups openly outside mosques incites violence against disbelievers. The radical groups argue against integration, saying that British Muslims are part not of British society but of the Islamic Ummah or world

community. The Commission for Racial Equality has warned that the radical groups are planting a time-bomb under harmony between Muslims and British society.

*** U.S. Diplomacy Over Kashmir Seen Irresponsible**

94AS0231E Calcutta THE TELEGRAPH in English
28 Feb 94 p 6

[Article by M.J. Akbar: "Histrionic About History"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] This country now has to deal with the United States' good intentions these days. There is a new mantra wafting out from Washington. Get everyone onto a table and talk, talk, talk. Or as they used to put it in old fashioned Americanese, it is better to jaw than to war.

The big success story of this mantra of course is the west Asia peace process, the entente between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organisation. If you can make a Jew and a Palestinian talk, you can open up a dialogue between God and Lucifer without problem.

Therefore the U.S. president, Mr. Bill Clinton, and his Oxford friend and present U.S. assistant secretary of state for south Asia, Ms. Robin Raphel, have decided that the time has come to make India and Pakistan talk to Kashmiris about Kashmir and to each other about this and other topics.

If only this wide world, full of all sorts of different characters, was so amenable to one plastic code. Sadly this is not so. Kashmir and Palestine are not in the same place. You cannot even will them to be the same. Palestine now remains in the last, if most tortured, item on an agenda which has gradually been edging towards a resolution after three major wars and one momentous peace—though the latter was only between Israel and Egypt. Any change in the *status quo* will be the beginning of problems rather than the end of them.

If there is a comparison, and it is not a too steady one at that, then it is with the former constituent republic of Yugoslavia, Bosnia. When a hundred Bosnians erupt all across India as Muslims pay the price for Mr. Clinton's theatrics, where will Ms. Raphel's concern for human rights get us? The problems of Kashmir cannot be separated from the events of 1947. Even more so the problems cannot be separated from the legitimacy of the rationale of the partition and all that went with it.

If the United States puts its weight behind the idea that Hindu and Muslim can never live together in the Indian sub-continent then we are staring at a tragedy of gruesome proportions. There is no force in the world large enough to control an India blazing with communal hatred.

Perhaps this is why Ms. Raphel is also seeking to change history when she suddenly begins to question the legality

of Kashmir's accession to India. Such a policy is madness. Good intentions are a poor excuse for irresponsibility of this magnitude. A little more reading of the facts, a touch of larger vision, would certainly help Washington. Words these days mean lives. We should take neither lightly.

*** Foreign Assistance Said Unneeded in Solving Kashmir Crisis**

94AS0222A Varanasi AJ in Hindi 1 Mar 94 p 6

[Article by Nikhil Chakravarty: "Kashmir Problem: External Interference and an Internal Initiative"]

[Text] There is a self-evident truth in our politics that whenever our independence or autonomy is endangered our whole nation stands up as one unit to a man. This happened in 1962 when China had attacked us at our northern border. The same thing happened in 1965 when we went to war with Pakistan. This happened again in 1971 when we took action against the armed invasion of Pakistan in order to free Bangladesh. In 1971, the whole nation had united against the U.S. "gunboat diplomacy" used in support of the Pakistani army. It should be known that the U.S. battleship Enterprise was exercising in the Bay of Bengal. Its purpose was to scare the Indian people, however, it failed in doing so. The only thing it succeeded in was making every section of Indian population angry.

Our five decades experience has made it clear how the people of this country meet any outside challenge or policy to intimidate and exploit us. The people will not bow to this, but will protect the pride and autonomy of their country.

The latest expression of this unique response is the nationwide Indian reaction to the conspiracies hatched in Washington supported by the leaders of Pakistan. The truth is that Pakistani noises made over Kashmir would not have affected us unless everyone from President Clinton down to low-level U.S. officials had not openly encouraged it to spew poison against the Indian stand. The anger that was created by the United States is not limited to its accusation of human rights violations by Indian troops. It includes its challenge to the truth about Kashmir's joining India and putting a question mark on it. The fact is that President Clinton and his assistants have declared the Kashmir issue as serious as the problems created by the civil war in Afghanistan. The Clinton government is openly encouraging Pakistani military officers and armed terrorists to encourage insurgency against the Indian government.

However, its effect is totally opposite to what was expected. How did this happen? This has created a solidarity and unity within the framework of Indian politics as was not seen since 1971. This national unity resulting from the foreign plot against India was demonstrated in the leadership of the government delegation to the UN Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva and the Kashmir-related resolution introduced in the

Parliament. There could not be a better display of a united national stand against the detestable conspiracy to separate Kashmir from the Indian Union.

This conclusion shows us the actual elements of the American policy in this region. The government policy-makers appeared to be working under the belief that after the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, Washington would think it necessary to consider India as a more dependable and stable unit compared to Pakistan in South Asia. At the same time, it was hypothesized that the disintegration of the Soviet Union would reduce Pakistan's importance in the American strategy for this region, because the United States would not need Pakistan as a military base in the changed international situation.

However, the emergence of facts proved both these notions to be wrong. The first reason for this is that despite economic liberalization, India is refusing to become a U.S. tributary or a supporter nation. The United States cannot consider India as a safe bet as long as this continues. The second reason is that the importance of Pakistan has not diminished in the Pentagon. The main basis for this is the possibility of expanding trade with the Central Asian countries, nearness to Pakistan, Kashmir, Tibet, and Sikiang which can be used for annoying China.

Against this background, anyone can realize how useless the Indian government's request to the U.S. Government to declare Pakistan a terrorist nation is. In contrast, the India deputation's criticism of the terrorism introduced from across the border at the Geneva meeting was very appropriate. It is equally important for the Indian officials to foil any third party's efforts to mediate in Kashmir because the United States would be behind it.

Keeping external interference out of Kashmir is one thing and dealing with this issue seriously as an internal problem is another; these two cannot be mixed up. We have been right in telling the rest of the world that unrest and tension in Kashmir is our internal issue. However, we also have to keep the fact in mind that we cannot resolve this issue just by saying that the whole problem was created by Pakistan. If we are honest with ourselves then we should not hesitate in admitting that our wrong approach in resolving this issue and the mistake of mixing up the political aspects with administrative aspects have created a feeling of alienation in the hearts and minds of the people in the valley. The truth is that the superficial and cheap strategy being used in the valley is an embarrassing situation for the Indian democracy. We still have the time to admit that the real key to solving Kashmir's problem is in the hands of this nation's government and the political parties. In order to find a permanent solution to this problem, they should take the effective and serious initiative of starting talks with the terrorist groups and their supporters in the Hariat Conference.

*** Pakistan Strategy on Kashmir Said Well-Planned**

94AS0231D Calcutta *THE TELEGRAPH* in English
3 Mar 94 p 6

[Article by Aabha Dixit: "Strategy on the Borderline"]

[Text] Islamabad is pulling out all stops in a bid to make international opinion question the legality of Kashmir's being part of India. In response a sense of urgency about resisting Pakistani designs appears to have cut across party lines in India. The unanimous resolution passed in both houses of Parliament condemning Islamabad's role in the valley takes India's Kashmir policy into high gear. The resolution provides bipartisan support for a stronger and more credible response by New Delhi to Islamabad's strategy of keeping up pressure in the international media.

Irrespective of the outcome of Islamabad's attempts to make the United Nations human rights sub-commission accept a resolution on Kashmir, New Delhi's political reactions will inevitably gain momentum.

But India's response requires an understanding of Pakistan's motives and tactics. As Sun Tzu, the Chinese military strategist wrote, "Know your enemy, know yourself, hundred battles, hundred victories."

With partition two mutually exclusive stereotypes have symbiotically grown together on either side of the border. Pakistan's ruling classes have fostered a feeling among their people that Indians are not reconciled to partition. That India would do anything to undo the deed and subject Muslims to Hindu rule.

The constant example given as proof is the case of Kashmir, a state in which a Muslim majority population is kept hostage for exploitation. In time Islamabad has been able to merge Pakistan's creation with the Kashmir problem. It has evolved into a general theoretical exposition that without Kashmir the concept of Pakistan remains incomplete.

In India the accession of Kashmir to the Union has been upheld as valid and final. Pakistan is seen as an eternal spoiler who will not rest till Kashmir has been wrenched from India, by force if necessary.

New Delhi has been highlighting Islamabad's attempts to quietly hide a disconcerting fact. Mohammad Ali Jinnah rejected outright the idea of a plebiscite in Jammu and Kashmir in 1947, a year before the first UN security council resolution. The memoirs of Louis Mountbatten have noted that when the viceroy suggested a plebiscite to Jinnah, the latter reacted by saying "it was redundant and undesirable to have a plebiscite when it was quite clear that states should go according to their majority population."

These two stereotype images have over time become self-evident truths. They have automated the reactions of the two neighbours to each others equally predictable actions.

New Delhi's perception has evolved as a result of its experience of handling Pakistan during the period 1947-71. Pakistan's military strategy was to launch a lightning offensive preceded by a relatively smaller infiltration period which they thought would be backed by the Muslim populace to decouple Kashmir from India.

After 1971 Islamabad's strategy underwent a subtle yet significant change. Zulfikar Ali Bhutto began using dual methods to deal with his enemies. On the one hand Bhutto acknowledged that India was the pre-eminent power in south Asia. On the other he began an improved version of the Kashmir strategy. He placed an emphasis on time and mass indoctrination inside Kashmir.

The main objective of Bhutto's policy was to disrupt, discredit and paralyse the Indian administration before committing Pakistani troops. He had by then realised mere sympathy for the cause did not have enough strength to win him Kashmir. What was required was a radicalisation of the population through religion. It is interesting that while Bhutto abhorred the role of the fundamentalist parties in domestic politics, he was not averse to seeking their support for his destabilising of Kashmir and Afghanistan.

In Kashmir, Bhutto used the organisational strength of fundamentalist parties with cross border affiliations to spread Islamic ideas as an antidote to the secular forces being projected by New Delhi. It began by focussing upon Islamic education. The Jamaat e Islami was useful because of its sway in the madrassas that rapidly spread throughout the rural areas of Kashmir valley.

The spread of Islamic ideals was the first element of the strategy of radicalising the Kashmiri Muslims. The second was the creation of an elaborate information ring within the Kashmiri government. The political crises of the period 1982 to 1987 allowed pro-Pakistani fundamentalist parties to exploit the alienation of the common Kashmiri.

Through the *maulvis* Islamabad was able to communicate with the common Kashmiri for the first time. It set up a fledgling organisation within Kashmir for greater use in future. Ms. Bhutto's overthrow did not mean the end of the Kashmir gambit. Instead the policy was streamlined, and the military's direct involvement increased.

It also received more funding because of Zia-ul-Haq's Islamicisation policies. The principle beneficiaries of the Islamic taxes *zakat* and *ushr* were the *ulema*. They in turn used it to consolidate their position on both sides of the border. Suddenly the *maulvi* became an economically important person, prepared to accept the radical programme that his handlers from Islamabad sold him. Most importantly, the policy of Islamicisation through education at the grassroots became an effective counter to the relatively successful philosophy propagated by New Delhi that Kashmiriyat was built on secularism.

New Delhi ignored the quiet revolution taking place inside Kashmir. It did not take advantage of the Afghan imbroglio to counter Islamabad's Kashmir operations. Instead New Delhi preferred to accept at face value the peace overtures made by the Zia regime in respect of Kashmir.

The greatest failure on the part of New Delhi was its inability to comprehend the changed Pakistani strategy and undertake counter measures. The prevalent thinking in New Delhi was that Islamabad would repeat its 1948 and 1965 strategies.

With Zia, the radicalisation of Kashmiri society proceeded at a feverish pace. The Inter-service Intelligence created a network of informers and sympathisers who penetrated every state government department. Infiltration and exfiltration routes were identified. Slowly weapons training along with ideological brainwashing began to be imparted in camps in Pakistan occupied Kashmir. By 1988 the trickle had become a flood. All that was required of Ms. Bhutto was to give the underground movement a green light with her *azadi* speech.

Between Ms. Bhutto's first and second terms, Islamabad was unable to push its Kashmir strategy because political stability returned to New Delhi. Further, militancy in the valley had come dangerously close to despondency as New Delhi remained unperturbed by terrorist attacks that included bombing police headquarters and numerous kidnappings.

Increased international attention had started bringing about a change in the perception of the human rights organisations. They began looking upon militant groups as violators. Amnesty International, the United States state department and Asia Watch began taking notice. Towards the end of the presidency of Mr. George Bush, the threat of being labelled a state sponsor of terrorism loomed large.

In a bid to wiggle out of this unhappy turn of events Islamabad began "privatising" the terror drive, bringing in fundamentalist parties as intermediaries to provide money, material and boost the morale of the militants. This transition was taking place at a time when a power struggle between the president and prime minister diverted Islamabad from the Kashmir effort.

In Ms. Bhutto's second term Islamabad's options had narrowed considerably. Militancy by itself was not capable of wrenching the state out of the Union. The militants were becoming demoralised. New recruits were becoming difficult to find. As a result, Islamabad had to relocate unemployed Afghan mercenaries into the valley in greater numbers to keep the pressure going. Continuation of the existing strategy allowed Mr. Sharif to get an upper hand in the domestic political tussle.

There was no other option for Ms. Bhutto other than to internationalise the dispute. She had to do something radically different to gain the high ground and boost the

militants. In this effort she was fortunate to find unexpected help from Ms. Robin Raphel, the U.S. assistant secretary of state in charge of the newly created south Asia bureau. Ms. Raphel had sought to reopen old controversies by disputing the legality of the Instrument of Accession, equating civil war in Afghanistan with insurgency in Kashmir.

The strategy adopted by the Benazir government has been to get as much exposure for its new stance. It tries to highlight the human rights facet of the Kashmir issue. By pushing this angle, Islamabad has hoped to capitalise upon international concern for human rights. It was therefore logical she would pursue a multi-pronged strategy.

She sought the Organisation of Islamic Conference's help, on grounds that Muslims were being "martyred" in the valley. In the larger and non-religious fora, like the UN General Assembly and the human rights commission, she sought to place Islamabad's charges on a secular plane. By attempting to turn up international pressure through the passage of a resolution in Geneva next week, Islamabad hopes to justify the other element of its strategy—the accession of the state of Pakistan.

In the coming days Islamabad's strategy will be to continue keeping Kashmir in the international spotlight, create hysteria in the West so that it could emerge as the fount of a nuclear conflagration and seek to give the Kashmiri secessionists the legitimacy of a national liberation movement.

The task before the Indian polity is one of monumental proportions. A combined effort must be made to send out an equivocal message of the inherent strength and determination of the nation to rise to any occasion. This could deter the building up of further pressure. But the most suitable rebuff to Islamabad's campaign would be the initiation of a political dialogue in the valley.

* Kashmiri Refugees Claim Government Ignorant of Plight

94AS0221D Calcutta THE STATESMAN in English
3 Mar 94 p 6

[Text] Bombay, March 2—Panun Kashmir, an organization of refugee Kashmiri Hindus, has criticized India's defence of the Kashmir issue at international forums, saying it was from "a very low level of moral credibility" as the country has been continuously changing its perception and projection of the problem. Demanding that India cut off diplomatic relations with Pakistan, the organization suggested that the Union Home Ministry entertain human rights bodies other than Amnesty International and Asia Watch which, they claim, are biased.

Following their return from the UN Human Rights Conference in Geneva, leaders of the organization addressed a press conference here today. The

spokesman, Mr. Ajay Chungroo, claimed there was evidence to suggest that Pakistan and the ISI [Inter-Service Intelligence of Pakistan] were involved in terrorist activities in this country. Even the Home Ministry, he claimed, had admitted as much.

Mr. Chungroo had presented a paper—on behalf of the Indian Institute for Non-Aligned Studies—on the minority and refugee status of Kashmiri Hindus at the conference, the first time the issue had been discussed at this level.

Another member of the delegation, Mr. Moti Kaul, said the overall impression was that most delegates were ignorant of the real issues in Kashmir and he blamed the Indian Government for this. He claimed that Panun Kashmir was doing the job of the Government but added, "We are not stooges."

Mr. Kaul claimed that Pandits were victims of the Government's policy on Kashmir. "Even today, between 250,000 and 300,000 Kashmiri Pandits forced to flee the State are living in sub-human conditions, refugees in their own homeland. And we thought it was time the international community was made aware of this," Mr. Kaul said.

While stating that they did not want to be "hostages of Indian secularism in Kashmir," Mr. Chungroo said that the fundamentalist-terrorist problem was spreading to Jammu. He criticized the Prime Minister for not visiting any of the refugee camps, not even those in New Delhi. "We are asking for our own territory, yes, but in such a way that we have greater integration with the country. We went to Geneva because we have India's interests at heart."

The members felt that India should not wait for the United States to declare Pakistan a terrorist state. The United States, they said, had its own agenda and sought "more direct involvement in the territorial problem for its own reasons." Criticizing the Government's inconsistent stand on Pakistan, Mr. Chungroo said: "It just can't go on. Instead of waiting for the United States we must demonstrate our firmness and cut off diplomatic ties."

Both Mr. Chungroo and Mr. Kaul were critical of the "excessive importance given by India to the Amnesty International and Asia Watch reports on human rights abuses. They questioned the reports that the abuses began in 1989 and pointed out that these organizations admitted that the scope of their investigations was limited.

Amnesty, they said, had stated that it examined human rights violations by the state, but they wondered who examined those committed by terrorists. "When we asked why they did not visit the refugee camps in Delhi even after they were provided the addresses last year, they said 'No time,'" Mr. Chungroo said.

The organization expressed disappointment that the resolution adopted by Parliament recently did not mention the refugee problem of Kashmiri Pandits and blamed all political parties for their perception of and approach to the problem. "Even the BJP because it is unable to go beyond the Article 370 issue," Mr. Chugroo said. They were confident, however, that the Centre's attempts to encourage Dr Farooq Abdullah's participation would backfire as "he is one of those who advocates autonomy" for Kashmir.

*** Editorial Questions U.S. Intentions in Kashmir**
BK1003131694 Delhi THE HINDUSTAN TIMES
in English 4 Mar 94 p 13

[Editorial: "Poser To Washington"]

[Text] Putting on record the first strong criticism by an Indian Government leader of the Clinton administration's stand on Kashmir, Home Minister S.B. Chavan sought to mark a watershed in Indo-U.S. relations when he told the Lok Sabha on Wednesday [March 2] that New Delhi would have to find out what Washington's intentions are. Mr. Chavan chose his words carefully. When he said it was absolutely clear the U.S. was not interested in helping either Pakistan or India but its own self, the Home Minister was suggesting that U.S. objectives in Kashmir were neither the protection of human rights of Kashmiris nor the elimination of a decades-old feud between two South Asian neighbours. That raises the question how the U.S. seeks to further its own interests in Kashmir and what these interests are. Mr. Chavan's statement is unlikely to elicit more than a staid explanation from Washington that its objective is to ensure human rights in Kashmir and elimination of tension between Pakistan and India which has the potential of a nuclear conflagration. But such officialese will not help in lifting the cloud of misunderstanding that is creeping into Indo-U.S. relations. Mr. Chavan's statement should be read in the context of two others that Indian ambassador in Washington Siddhartha Shankar Ray made in recent weeks. The import of Mr. Ray's first pronouncement was that India is aware of the grey areas of America's human rights record and the nature of possible minority demands, but has refrained from mentioning them. The second statement was that the idea of holding a plebiscite in Kashmir is an absurdity. Together, these assertions mean, first, that none should pelt stones at others while sitting in a glass house and, secondly, that to be able to help common friends engaged in a feud, one must be aware of the ground realities to acquire the minimum credentials to be an honest broker.

The Clinton administration is astonishingly out of touch with the realities in South Asia. Unless Washington wants a strategic base in an independent Kashmir, it is difficult to see why it must persist in making statements at the level of Mr. Clinton and Ms. Raphael the only consequence of which can be boosting the sagging morale of the militants. Mr. Chavan has asked Washington to

explain its stand on Kashmir because Ms. Raphael questions the validity of Kashmir's accession to India and claims that she is reflecting the administration's view. At the same time, the U.S. charge d'affaires in New Delhi asserts that Washington's stand is different from what she says. The American explanation needs to be unambiguous. Unless it is so, doubts will grow about a carefully executed programme of disinformation to confuse India opinion-makers (politicians, media and professionals) and thereby weaken the Government's resolve to withstand extraneous pressure over Kashmir or non-proliferation. If the U.S. can demand Indian transparency over human rights in Kashmir, New Delhi can use a matching right to ask the U.S. to be transparent about its intentions in Kashmir. It is not polemics but a necessity, especially because the U.S. sense of involvement in Kashmir shows no signs of waning although its role as an honest broker has carried it nowhere.

*** Commentary Views Foreign Mercenary Threat in Kashmir**

BK0503135994 Delhi All India Radio General Overseas Service in English 1010 GMT 5 Mar 94

[Commentary by Darshan Singh, president, Small Newspapers Editors Guild]

[Text] Foreign mercenaries have added a new menacing twist to the situation in the Kashmir Valley by infiltrating in large numbers with modern weaponry. Security Forces Director General Mr. D.K. Arya, in a recent interview to a Bombay newspaper, said there are at least 3,000 foreign mercenaries active in Kashmir Valley. These mercenaries are mostly Afghans, Lebanese, Sudanese, and Egyptians. They have been showing an increasing presence in the valley and beyond in Doda and Kishtwar and most of the areas westward. In a recent meeting, the Indian ambassador to the United States, Mr. S.S. Ray, told the under secretary of state, Mr. Peter Tarnoff that foreign mercenaries promoted by external forces are deeply involved in Kashmir crisis which is one of the important causes for persistence of terrorist violence there. These terrorists are well entrenched and possess the most modern system of fire arms, ammunition, and wireless sets. They have equipment like the ones available with the organized defense forces only. The number of Halogen [as heard] 60-mm mortars, rocket launchers, rifles, grenades, sniper rifles, AK-47 rifles, and ammunition have been seized from them in a series of raids conducted by the security forces in the past few months.

The infiltration of mercenaries began about a year ago mostly through Pak-occupied Kashmir. Pakistani soldiers provided them with cover under a heavy barrage of firing on the Line of Control as they sneaked into the Indian territory in small numbers. These mercenaries have excellent training as most of them fought against Russians and then against Hekmatyar in Afghanistan. When Afghan war against former Soviet Union ended, these Islamic militants simply moved to another front,

that is, Kashmir. That is why they are very different from the earlier Kashmiri militants, who usually adopted hit-and-run tactics.

These mercenaries are being looked after by the Inter-Services Intelligence [ISI] of Pakistan financially and also with constant supply of sophisticated weapons and gadgets. They are basically fugitives in their own country, persona non grata, and would therefore be tried or shot. Their only motivation for involvement in terrorist activities in Kashmir comes from an icon of religion [as heard] suggesting suitable brainwashing by ISI which gives them an added zeal. These mercenaries are virtually leading the terrorist movement in the valley at present. The seeds of terrorism originating in Afghan conflict seems to have boiled over to this part of the world. Recent media coverages televised in USA and Canada offer compelling evidence in support of India's mounting concern over the spread of terrorist violence in South Asia, particularly in Kashmir valley. Activities of these trained terrorist hordes have also resulted in such tragic incidents as the bombing of an Air India airliner over the Atlantic ocean in 1985 and the attack of the World Trade Center in New York City last year.

Despite the continuing involvement of foreign mercenaries and persisting terrorist violence promoted by alien forces, India has not diluted its commitment to the restoration of the political process in Jammu and Kashmir. With this aim in view, the government is at present engaged in the onerous [as heard] task of bringing peace and normality in the valley. Attempts of militants to step up violence in the valley and cause large-scale law and order problem through destruction of Muslim shrines, including Hazratbal, have been frustrated in the recent past.

Besides infiltration of foreign mercenaries, narco-smuggling is also playing a damaging role in Kashmir. Pakistan's drug barons are engaged directly and indirectly in providing financial and other support to militants who utilize this money for procuring modern weaponry with a view to creating law and order problem in Jammu and Kashmir. Is this the drug and arms peddling nation that waxes eloquent on human rights at Geneva? [sentence as heard].

*** Article Questions How Long Government Will Disregard Pandits**

94AS0222C New Delhi JANSATTA in Hindi 5 Mar 94
p 6

[Article by Kranti Kumar Sharma: "How Long Will the Displaced Kashmiris Be Neglected?"]

[Text] The Indian delegates attending the UN Human Rights Commission's 50th conference have declared Pakistan's failure to get support for its resolution on human rights violations in Kashmir as their great victory. However, the displaced Kashmiris have played a very important role in this success. They not only exposed the insincerity of Pakistan's worry about human rights, but also informed the international community of

its wicked plans to spread terrorism. Will the government continue to be uninvolved in the pain of the hundreds of thousands of Kashmiris who are living like refugees in their own country?

Ajay Churungoo, president of the Kashmiri Pandits organization, Panun Kashmir, appealed to the Human Rights Commission asking that before cultural disintegration and ethnic genocide happens, the international community should interfere and stop it. According to him more than 300,000 Kashmiri Pandits had to flee the valley to avoid terrorism. Pakistan has always tried to strengthen the fundamentalists in the valley to take over Kashmir. Now, the Kashmiri Pandits are living like refugees in a democratic and secular nation like India. The terrorist activities in Kashmir have transformed into efforts to get rid of the minority Hindus in the valley. This is the climax of the ethnic genocide of this peace-loving group. The purpose of the terrorists behind this violence is to annihilate all the non-Muslim groups in Kashmir and form a society based on the supremacy and control of one religion. The violent activities of the terrorists in Kashmir cannot be declared appropriate because of their political or so-called idealist values. The terrorism in Kashmir is not a war for independence in any sense. An independence effort that destroys other people's independence just is not appropriate.

The Indo-European Kashmir Forum also called a press conference to get international support for the Kashmiri Hindus. The president of this forum is Dr. Shakti Bhan Khanna, and includes Dr. K.N. Pandita, president of Panun Kashmir's women branch, and the leaders of the Daughters of Vitasta and Friends of Kashmir. These Kashmiri leaders said that the Kashmiri Pandits have been pushed into the margins because of Islamic fundamentalism and violence spread by the terrorists for the last five years. About 300,000 Kashmiri Pandits were forced to flee the valley because of murders, rapes, verbal abuse, humiliation of women, and physical tortures. About 100,000 Pandits have been mercilessly murdered. They expressed regret that the international community, especially the human rights organizations and communication media, have not paid any attention to the prolonged tragedy of Kashmiri Pandits. The representatives of human rights organizations have not visited even once after 1990 to observe the Kashmiri Pandits who have directly suffered from Pakistani conspiracies. It is ironical that none of the organizations in the world that claim to protect human rights have taken this human tragedy seriously. According to Kashmiri leaders, they also met with the Amnesty International and other human rights organizations. However, Amnesty flatly said that it only deals with terrorism in which governments are involved. When Amnesty was told that the terrorism in Kashmir is spread by Pakistan, it did not pay any attention to it.

It is a result of Kashmir Pandits' activities that there is a possibility of Kashmir Pandits' problems being discussed in a sub-committee meeting of the Human Rights

Commission in Geneva this summer. Abraham Fall, assistant general secretary of the UN Human Rights Commission, told the leaders of Kashmiri refugees that the problem of Kashmiri Pandits is really serious and it is imperative that an acceptable solution of this problem is found. Some Kashmiri separatists had insisted to Abraham Fall to send a fact-finding commission to Kashmir. However, he had rejected this request saying that he did not want to form any presumptions on this issue.

The Kashmir Pandits are greatly perturbed by the Indian government's lack of interest. During the last week of December last year, they had organized the first Kashmiri Pandits Conference in Delhi. In this conference they declared Pakistan a terrorist nation and appealed to human rights organization, religious groups, and all the countries in the world to declare Pakistan a terrorist nation for encouraging terrorism in India. The "Delhi Declaration" was issued at the end of this conference. This declaration said that Kashmiri Pandits will increase their efforts to get Panun Kashmir back. It also had a map of Panun Kashmir which shows the region from Baramulla in the northeast of the Vitasta River to Baramulla as part of Panun Kashmir. The Delhi Declaration asked that Panun Kashmir be under the central government and that the Indian Constitution be fully implemented there.

The demand for a separate homeland by the Kashmiri Pandits may appear to be impractical but they have used this demand for outlining their needs for resettlement. The Kashmiri refugees are suffering from a double tragedy. The Pakistan-supported terrorism has forced them to leave their homes on the one side, and the government's neglect on the other side has made things even worse. The demand for a homeland will not solve the problem, however, we have to understand that the Kashmiri Pandits cannot be totally ousted from Kashmir. Kashmir belong to them as much as it does to those of other religions living there. It is the government's responsibility to create the opportunities for this peace-loving group displaced by the terrorists to return to the valley. However, the government does not seem to be serious at all about it. The Bharatiya Janata Party has demanded several times in the Parliament and in the streets for plans to resettle and return the Kashmiris to their home. However, the government did not pay any heed to it. Should not our government pay attention to the Kashmiri refugees after returning from Geneva?

*** Official Calls Withdrawal of Pakistan Resolution Unconditional**

BK1003133294 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1230 GMT 10

[Text] New Delhi has made it clear that Pakistan's withdrawal of its resolution in Geneva is unconditional, and there is no question of linking it with sending a fact-finding mission to Kashmir. The foreign secretary, Mr. Srinivasan, told a crowded press conference in New Delhi today that India sought an early vote on the

resolution as it was confident that it will be defeated. While reaffirming India's readiness to continue dialogue with Pakistan, he said there is no scope for Iran or any other country to mediate on the issue. He said Pakistan has failed in its third attempt to raise the issue in the international fora. Mr. Srinivasan hoped that Islamabad will now embark on a more constructive path of a bilateral dialogue to settle the issue with India.

The Congress(I) has congratulated the government for effectively thwarting the attempts of Pakistan at the UN Human Rights Commission at Geneva to internationalize the Kashmir issue. In a press release issued in New Delhi today, the party spokesman, Mr. V.N. Gadgil, described the developments as a diplomatic success for India as Pakistan found itself totally isolated in the international community. He said the clear message to Pakistan from Geneva is that it must go back to the Shimla pact.

The All India Minorities Front has hailed the diplomatic victory achieved by the government on Kashmir. In a statement in New Delhi, the Front president, Mr. S.M. Arif, said the outcome of the Geneva meeting proved that the so-called human rights violations in Kashmir are mere propaganda by Pakistan to defame India.

The Communist Party of India has expressed the hope that good sense will prevail on the Pakistan Government now that it has withdrawn its resolution at the UN Commission on Human Rights at Geneva. In a statement issued in New Delhi today, the National Executive of the party said that Pakistan should make an honest effort to solve it within the framework of the Shimla agreement.

*** Official Statement, Opposition Response to Kashmir Resolution**

BK1103010694 Delhi All India Radio Network in English 1530 GMT 10 Mar 94

[Text] New Delhi says Pakistan's withdrawal of its resolution in Geneva is unconditional, and there is no question of linking it with sending of a fact-finding mission to Kashmir. The foreign secretary, Mr. Srinivasan, told a crowded press conference in New Delhi today that India sought an early vote on the resolution as it was confident that the resolution will be defeated. While reaffirming India's readiness to continue dialogue with Pakistan, he said there is no scope for Iran or any other country to mediate on this issue. He said Pakistan has failed in its third attempt to raise the issue in the international fora. Mr. Srinivasan hoped that Islamabad will now embark on a more constructive path of a bilateral dialogue to settle the issues with India.

On the Iranian ambassador's suggestion at Geneva for sending a group of ambassadors from Muslim countries to visit Kashmir, the foreign secretary said it cannot be termed as an international fact-finding mission. This facility is already available as no prior permission is

needed for all New Delhi-based ambassadors except Pakistan and Libya. He pointed out that a team of 10 ambassadors had been to Jammu and Kashmir. They included four members of the Organization of Islamic Countries. Mr. Srinivasan also said that there is automatic deferment of the Pakistani resolution to the next session of the UN Human Rights Commission as once the resolution is withdrawn, it has to start the process anew. He said 15 countries specifically asked Pakistan to withdraw its resolution after a brief postponement of voting, and five of them wanted India and Pakistan to continue their bilateral dialogue. He said the Indian delegation had done a good job in Geneva. Replying to a question, he said the time is not yet ripe for permitting Amnesty International delegation to visit Kashmir as its report on the Bombay blast was biased.

All the major political parties have expressed happiness and satisfaction over the outcome of the Pakistani resolution in Geneva yesterday. The Congress(I) spokesman, Mr. V.N. Gadgil, described Islamabad's withdrawal of the resolution as a diplomatic success for India.

The BJP [Bharatiya Janata Party] leader, Mr. Murli Manohar Joshi, congratulating the Indian delegation, urged the government to take firm action to curb militancy in the valley.

The CPI-M [Communist Party of India-Marxist] General Secretary, Mr. Harkishen Singh Surjeet, expressing satisfaction over yesterday's happenings in Geneva, has called upon the government to find a political solution to the Kashmir issue.

In a statement in New Delhi today, the National Executive of the CPI has asked Pakistan to refrain from internationalizing the Kashmir issue and make an honest effort to resolve it within the framework of the Shimla Agreement.

*** Minister Says Kashmir Open to Foreign Journalists**

*BK1603101194 Delhi All India Radio Network
in English 0830 GMT 16 Mar 94*

[Text] The minister of state for external affairs, Mr. R.L. Bhatia, said over 150 foreign journalists visited Jammu and Kashmir last year. In a written reply in the Rajya Sabha today, he said Pakistan has been indulging in a disinformation campaign alleging that members of international media cannot visit Jammu and Kashmir. He said the government is taking all steps to inform the international community that there is no restriction on visits of foreign journalists to the state.

*** Talks With India Over Kashmir Examined**

94AS0209C Karachi AKHBAR-E-JEHAN in Urdu
16 Jan 94 p 8

[Article by Habibul Rehman: "Exclusion of Kashmiri Freedom Fighters]

[Text] Pakistan and India have agreed to include Kashmiris in talks and to continue sincere efforts to resolve the Kashmir issue. This agreement was expressed in the joint communique issued by the foreign secretaries of both countries in Islamabad on 3 January after the two-day talks. Mr. Shaheryar Khan, Pakistan's foreign ministry secretary, said that additional talks at any level will be held only after the situation in occupied Kashmir improves and the practice of human rights violation is ended. Mr. J. N. Dixit, the Indian foreign secretary, referred to his meeting with Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto on 2 January in his briefing to the Indian news correspondents and hinted that he expected the prime ministers of India and Pakistan to meet in the near future. To pave way for the leaders' meeting, one or two divisions of the Indian army now in Kashmir will be transferred to another area. There is also the possibility of giving permission to the representatives of some international human rights agencies to visit Kashmir and stay in Srinagar. Prime Minister Narasimha Rao has decided to call a conference of the leaders of Indian political parties this month to see how far India should move towards conciliation when the Pakistani prime minister visits Delhi. The Indian prime minister will also discuss the proposal suggested by the United States, Europe, and Japan to put Kashmir under UN administration and establish a caretaker government under a UN appointed administrator with representatives from all Kashmiri groups in this proposed conference.

A Kashmiri leader who supports independence of Kashmir has returned after finishing his jail term in Belgium. He is busy assuring Pakistani leaders that the proposed independent Kashmir will have the same relationship with Pakistan as is between a younger and elder brother. Although it was Pakistan's prominent lawyer S.M. Zaffar who defended and won freedom for Amanullah Khan, chairman of Jammu-Kashmir Liberation Front (JKLF), from the Belgian jail, the JKLF members believe that moral support from more than one Western nations played an important part in this release. The JKLF chairman appeared in Islamabad when the foreign secretaries of India and Pakistan were holding talks, and began to publicize his proposal of an independent Kashmir through his speeches and statements in the newspapers. Mr. Amanullah Khan said in an interview that Pakistan was not in a position to get all of Kashmir through diplomatic pressure or the use of strength. That is why the JKLF is demanding an independent Kashmir. The JKLF believes that the proposed independent Kashmir will always be a friend of Pakistan and it will have the same attitude as of a younger brother. The

younger brother will want to have a defense pact with the elder brother and will assure that river water coming from Kashmir will always keep the great land of Pakistan green and fertile. Referring to historical records, the JKLF chairman recalled that when Quaid-e Azam Mohammed Ali Jinnah had talked about the independence of states, he had presented the case of freeing former Hyderabad in the U.N. Security Council and had recognized the right of states to independence. Dr. Mehboob-ul Haq, a former finance minister in Pakistani government, is also in Islamabad after visiting the United States. He is advocating putting Kashmir under UN administration for the interim period.

When the announcement to hold talks with India at foreign secretaries level were made while the curfew was still imposed in Srinagar's Hazratbal shrine and human rights were still being violated rampantly in occupied Kashmir, the rationale was given that the consortium of the nation that was to issue aid and loan to Pakistan was meeting the following month and Pakistan's request would be considered with full sympathy. Despite any progress in the talks that concluded on 3 January in Islamabad, since our government has promised to continue this series of talks, it is expected that we will be rewarded and new loans worth two or two and one-half billion dollars will be approved. It should be remembered that our foreign ministry had announced India was being given a last opportunity through the Islamabad talks.

The leaders of Pakistan should not make statements on declare positions that they cannot keep or make promises they cannot fulfill. Such caution will assure that Pakistani people are not embarrassed again. Pakistan perhaps is relieved to hear that the Indian foreign secretary did not refuse to discuss the Kashmir issue. He was also pressured as the United States, some European nations, and Japan had insisted on starting discussions on Kashmir. India could not deny their order. These nations are investing nine billion dollars annually in India and it was important to obey them to make sure the investment continued to flow in. Perhaps India will tell these investors that the order to start negotiations has been fulfilled and it is their responsibility now to admonish Pakistan and prepare it for some understanding. The two points of understanding that are being publicized are mentioned in beginning of this article. Kashmir is basically the problem of the Kashmiri people and the majority of them live in occupied Kashmir. The people of that region are the ones that are fighting and making all kinds of sacrifices. It would be appropriate if Pakistan finds out from the freedom fighters if they approve the idea of an independent Kashmir or a Kashmir under the UN administration. There are 37 groups in occupied Kashmir and they have formed the All Parties Hariat Conference. If the United States convinces most of the groups in this organization to let Kashmir be put under the UN administration, it would be impossible for Pakistan to retain its declared stand after that. Pakistan will have to change its stand and face

the embarrassment that will go with it. If the majority of the conference insisted on a referendum, then it will be important to know whether the proposed referendum will be limited to the choices of joining India or Pakistan or will there be additional options. If the Kashmiris are the ones who will give the opinion and the decision on Kashmir's future will be made according to their wishes then it is their right to increase the choices for a referendum. The United Nations will also have to accept their wishes. The United States will be very happy if the Kashmiris decide to remain under the United Nations for five or six years before the referendum is taken. India will not be any less pleased as it would get rid of a major problem.

* Kashmir Said Destined To Be Pakistani

94AS0209A Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 26 Jan 94 p 3

[Editorial: "Kashmir is Part of Pakistan"]

[Text] The people of occupied Kashmir have announced their decision to celebrate "black day" on India's independence day. The purpose of this action is abrogate India's claim on occupied Kashmir. Celebration of the "black day" means that the people of Kashmir want independence from India. In this context, the All Jammu and Kashmir Freedom Conference has appealed to everyone to observe a strike in all of Kashmir. This announcement was endorsed by all religious, political and militant groups in Kashmir. The Indian administration is greatly worried by this announcement to observe a "black day" and has strengthened security measures. It has increased the number of military and para-military forces outside important buildings in Srinagar and other cities and has arrested a large number of Kashmiri leaders and young people. The freedom fighters are also determined not to allow observance of India's independence day in occupied Kashmir. They plan to respond strongly if the Indian military tries to ruin their plans for observing a strike and demonstrating. In addition to this effort in occupied Kashmir, Kashmiris living in capitals and important cities of other countries will demonstrate against India and demand resolving the Kashmir issue according to the UN resolutions. The Indian security forces will use force to foil the "black day" plans, however, it will not reap any political benefit from it. The international community knows that Kashmir is a disputed territory and the people there are fighting against India's occupation.

The Kashmiris are not alone in their efforts to get rid of the Indian occupation. Azad Kashmir and Pakistan will observe solidarity day with Kashmiris on 5 February. The Jamaat-i Islami had first announced to observe this solidarity day. Later, Nawaz Sharif, the opposition leader and president of the Muslim League, appealed for a general strike to show solidarity with the Kashmiri people. The government also announced to observe general strike on 5 February to protest India's occupation of Kashmir and the atrocities it is committing on Kashmiri people. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto

expressed solidarity with the Kashmiris to the nation in a speech broadcasted on Monday evening. She said Kashmir is Pakistan's artery and she herself was going to present the case in the UN Human Rights Commission. The 5 February strike will prove that Kashmir belongs to an undivided nation. The prime minister loudly announced in her speech that Kashmir is a part of Pakistan and is our legacy. This problem will not be solved until India agrees to a political solution. Some people believe that Madam Benazir Bhutto had not said anything new about India, except that her tone was sterner. It is believed that Pakistan's attitude about Kashmir has become stricter now.

Whatever the reason, the government has begun to believe now that the Kashmir issue cannot be resolved by talks with India and Pakistan must take some effective steps to help the Kashmiris. The prime minister took the right step by supporting the solidarity celebration for February. This would make up for the government's mistake of holding talks at foreign secretaries level. The cooperation between the government and the people will help present the Kashmiri issue to the world more effectively. India will learn that the people of Kashmir and Pakistan are united against it.

* Editorial Urges UN, Western Action on Kashmir

BK0102121994 Rawalpindi JANG in Urdu 28 Jan 94 p 3

[Editorial: "Occupied Kashmir—Indian Republic Day or Black Day?"]

[Text] India observed its Republic Day the other day with pomp and pageantry, publicly displaying for the first time its devastating Prithvi missile and demonstrating its might to Pakistan and other neighboring countries. The steps taken by India, such as the use of closed-circuit televisions, to deal with any possible danger on that day in various cities, particularly in occupied Kashmir, indicate that the Indian authorities were driven by an unknown fear that prompted them to show off their military might and declare their desire for supremacy. The way the Kashmiri mohajedin shattered the Indian troops' tight security steps by firing volleys of missiles and rockets on Srinagar and targeting 30 military camps testifies to the fact that India, despite all its oppressive strength and repressive machinations, could not dampen the morale of the highly-spirited fighters of the independence movement in Kashmir who are fully capable of making their existence felt wherever and whenever they like. The fleeing of Indian security forces and even the adviser to the Kashmir governor in the face of the mohajedin's unrelenting barrage of missiles on Bakhshi Stadium prove that India is maintaining its hold on Kashmir only with the help of its oppressive measures. Every individual, even a child, in Kashmir detests India and aspires to get rid of its clutches. Turning Indian Republic Day into a Black Day in occupied Kashmir is in fact a message to the United Nations and a call to Western countries to ignore their selfish interests

and rid the Kashmiris of Indian domination. Otherwise, the people of Kashmir will smash this yoke and chain of slavery themselves.

*** Editorial Notes, Welcomes Change in Russia's Kashmir Stand**

BK0102142594 Rawalpindi JANG in Urdu 1 Feb 94 p 3

[Editorial: "Russian Support for Kashmiris' Right to Self-Determination"]

[Text] Talking to the JANG representative at Davos, Russian Minister Yegor Gaydar has said that Russia supports the Kashmiris' right to self-determination, adding that we have gotten rid of the agony of the Soviet Union on the basis of self-determination. Earlier, Russian President Yeltsin, in a letter to the Indian Government, expressed his concern over the blatant violation of human rights by the Indian security forces in occupied Kashmir and urged the Indian rulers to stop the atrocities. It was not only the United States and other Western countries that had kept patting India on the back for not implementing the UN resolutions on holding a plebiscite on the Kashmir issue, but Russia, too, which, during the Soviet Union era, openly supported India on the issue. This had been the Russian posture all along—from vetoing Security Council resolutions against India to Nikita Khrushchev's outright rejection of Kashmir as an issue.

Recent statements by personalities holding the most important positions in Russia on human rights violations in occupied Kashmir and in support of the Kashmiris' right to self-determination indicate the emergence of a positive change in the Russian foreign policy after the disintegration of the erstwhile Soviet Union. This can be termed as a welcome development for the resolution of this long-standing issue. The shift in the Russian stand on occupied Kashmir—no matter whether due to a greater awareness in the United States and other Western countries of the human rights violations in the valley, or to the tough resistance by the Kashmiris—is a good and welcome change that will help secure an early solution to the Kashmir problem.

*** Paper Criticizes Amanullah Khan's Ideology on Kashmir**

BK0402101594 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu 1 Feb 94 p 4

[Editorial: "Kashmir—Amanullah's Role"]

[Text] Amanullah Khan, Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front [JKLF] Chairman, has announced that his political ideology is guided by an ideology based on the spirit of freedom, patriotism, and complete sovereignty of the Jammu and Kashmir state. He emphasized that not only the JKLF leadership but also a majority of members from other parties are in favor of the "third option." He added that he has been supporting this ideology for three decades. So far as his statement that he has been propagating the ideology for the full sovereignty

of Kashmir for three decades is concerned, it is imperative to note that the "third option" rubbish is both illogical and unjustifiable. This is due not only to the fact that it is against Pakistan's security, the formula for the partition of the Indian subcontinent, and UN resolutions, it is also against the spirit of the Kashmiri people witnessed in the form of a freedom movement since the time of the Dogra rulers. The Kashmiri people have also been shown this spirit in the hoisting of the Pakistani flag in occupied Kashmir on Pakistan's national day, ignoring the rain of bullets and curfew restrictions. Until today, the Kashmiri people have raised only one voice, that is, annexation with Pakistan through a plebiscite. Amanullah Khan, who is raising his voice for a sovereign Kashmir against this "popular will" of the Kashmiri people, is actively clamoring for it at a time when the United States is also exerting pressure for some solution. And the American attempt is apparently aimed at imposing India over China's head through a sovereign Kashmir [sentence as published].

Even if we accept that Amanullah Khan has been recommending the third option for three decades, he cannot be justified in propagating this idea. Which democracy permits the domination of a baseless ideology of any so-called leader against the wishes of the people and the interest of the nation? The reality is that the people of Kashmir are opting to join Pakistan. Of course, if any leader wants the third option, it is entirely a different matter which has nothing to do with the spirit of the Kashmiri people. The sole objective of having a sovereign Kashmir state is to make this region a base for American conspiracies against Pakistan and China. The people of Kashmir also have faith in the ideology of the father of the nation, the great leader Mohammad Ali Jinnah, that Kashmir is the jugular vein of Pakistan. In addition to the parties taking part in the freedom movement, every Kashmiri wants to seek help from Pakistan alone at this delicate moment. The reason is that every Kashmiri considers himself a Pakistani and the basic element of their freedom movement is exercising the right to self-determination and making Kashmir a part of Pakistan. In the craze for building his own sandcastle, Amanullah Khan cannot mutilate the history of the freedom movement of Kashmir, nor can the so-called ideology he has recommended get the approval of the people of Kashmir. The JKLF itself in the occupied valley does not support a sovereign Kashmir. The viewpoint of the Kashmiris is quite clear.

*** Kashmiris Said Waiting for Muslim Conqueror**

94AS0213C Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 1 Feb 94 p 3

[Article by Mohammed Raza Allah Al-Muslim: "Kashmir: Waiting for Pakistani Conqueror"]

[Text] Heaven on earth, Kashmir, is spread across 83,000 square miles in the northeast part of Pakistan, with 5.2 million people, the majority of whom are Muslims. Of this land, 58,000 square miles are under

India's control and have been, since 1948, when India forcibly occupied it. India has made the people there its slaves. But they are not willing to accept Indian slavery at any cost, and they have proved this from India's partition through India's conspiracy (1971). In every war, the people here helped the Pakistani military against India. In every war, India faces awful embarrassment here. Still, after its military successes, the Kashmiris were unsuccessful. Be it the Gurdaspura crisis of 1947, the UN interference drama of 1948, the Tashkent Pact after the 1965 war, or the Shimla Pact after the 1971 war, whenever the Kashmiris were at the door of independence, they were forced again to wear the shackles of slavery for one reason or another. This time around, they took advantage of the Afghanistan jihad and started a similar struggle with similar feelings and zeal. It seems that, along with winning their freedom, they will also succeed in the disintegration of India, in the same way the Soviet Union was disintegrated.

The freedom struggle of the Kashmiris is very old. Many times the harvest of their freedom struggle was ready; however, the "farmers who lacked strategy" were unable to reap this harvest appropriately, and they ruined it severely. After the fall of the Moguls in 1846, the region of Kashmir was sold to an atrocious Dogra king, Ghulab Singh, for 7.5 million rupees. The Kashmiri Muslims, fed up with Ghulab Singh's atrocities, began a struggle for independence in the beginning of the 20th century, one that is still going on. It has arrived at a point where hundreds of thousands of Kashmiris have been martyred and the perfume emanating from their sacrifice is spread all over the world. The mutilated bodies of the martyrs traveled through the River Jhelum and the Sindh and shook up the people living on the shores of the Arabian Sea. These scenes were broadcast on satellite TV to the whole world, exposing the wicked, scary face of India. The whole world has heard the echoes of the slogans of the Kashmiri people and understands the relationship of the Kashmiri people with Pakistan.

May Allah grant the Kashmiri people freedom from India this time, so they do not become the victims of another devilish decision. Amin! It appears that as Kashmir's struggle for freedom gains momentum, "political harvest quails," which actually are instrumental in the hands of enemies of Islam, are suggesting all kinds of solutions to the Kashmir problem. They will never benefit Pakistan, Kashmiris, or the Islamic world.

What do the Kashmiris want? One may learn by seeing documentary films about Kashmir. The open eyes of the martyred people, the green flag in the hands of the martyrs, and the slogans of joining Pakistan that are on their lips all appear to be waiting for a victor coming from Pakistan.

* International Community's 'Silence' Over Kashmir Attacked

94AS0214B Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 3 Feb 94 p 3

[Editorial: "Criminal Silence of the International Community"]

[Text] At present, in two regions of the world—occupied Kashmir and Bosnia—a lot of atrocities are being committed, and human rights are being violated. The international community, however, is sitting like a silent spectator. The United Nations and major powers worldwide do not feel the need to play their required role in obtaining the right of self-determination for the Kashmiris or the protection of Bosnia. When it comes to the interests of the United States and European nations, the United Nations and its Security Council suddenly become very active. The silence of the world over the present situation in occupied Kashmir and Bosnia is deplorable and unbearable. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto addressed a meeting of the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva and tried to call the attention of the international community to the problems in occupied Kashmir and Bosnia. She said, "The present situation in Kashmir is unacceptable, and so is the silence of the world." The prime minister made it clear to the meeting's participants that the people of Kashmir have a very simple desire: independence. "You cannot suppress the freedom fighters for very long," Bhutto said. "Atrocities and extremities cannot last very long. This is a lesson of history, and despite India's atrocities and suppression, the people of Jammu and Kashmir have made its efforts futile." Madam Benazir Bhutto has definitely advocated the interests of the people of Kashmir very effectively. Her speech was greatly praised and the issue was declared a great cause of concern. The real problem, however, is to see if the international community will do something to stop Indian atrocities against the Kashmiri people and whether they will help them gain their right to freedom. In the past, the United Nations and other international forums praised the efforts of Pakistani representatives and diplomats; however, they did not take any practical steps to help the Kashmiris get their independence. The conscience of the international community is dead, and it is not willing to do anything to stop the savage acts of the Indian armed forces in Kashmir. In this situation, relations between India and Pakistan have become extremely tense. Pakistan tried to resolve this issue by holding talks, but India's stubbornness prevented it from making any progress. Pakistan has not proposed any new plans. Instead, it is still firm on the principle of resolving the Kashmir issue of independence through the UN resolutions. If India continues to violate human rights in occupied Kashmir and practices its stubbornness in declining to recognize the right of Kashmiris to freedom, then there will be no guarantee of peace in South Asia. Resolution of the Kashmir problem according to the wishes of the Kashmiri people is very important for establishing peace in south Asia.

* Bhutto's Kashmir Policy Examined

94AS0209B Peshawar MASHRIQ in Urdu 8 Feb 94 p 10

[Article by Syed Anwar Ghalib: "Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's Kashmir Policy"]

[Text] Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's concern about Kashmir has doubled now because of the problems in

Kashmir-occupied India and the increased skirmishes between Kashmiri freedom fighters and Indian troops. That is why she has announced a nationwide government holiday on 5 February to show support for the armed efforts of the freedom fighters in Kashmir. By showing full government support, she has shown Pakistani Government's moral, political, diplomatic, and native unity with Kashmir. She has thus stimulated the whole nation against India so that India can be embarrassed, disgraced, and humiliated in front of the whole world. The prime minister of Pakistan had shown unprecedented softness, leniency, pragmatism, and goodwill about Kashmir during Rajiv Gandhi's government. This ended during V.P. Singh's time when Mr. Mohan Singh was appointed the governor. Benazir herself had ended this approach in the Pakistan memory tent during the golden jubilee celebration of the Lahore Resolution. This was her most famous government-sponsored rally. Benazir Bhutto had decided the PPP policy and political action related to Kashmir on the advice of ISI and high military officers. She has thus made the anti-India politics of fundamentalists and religious fanatics ineffective among the people. The young prime minister using her quick wit has become the leader of the hot-blooded people who want to raise Pakistan's flag on Delhi. The United States and India still consider her more liberal than Nawaz Sharif. However, the intensity of her attitude towards Kashmir and India will make her more acceptable to the United States as compared to Mohammed Nawaz Sharif. The prime minister's belief is based on her late father Zulfikar Ali Bhutto's declaration that if necessary Pakistan will fight with India for a thousand years. Mrs. Benazir Bhutto, to counter the great internal pressure over Kashmir, has decided to follow the policy of going with the people. The protest strike of 5 February actually declares her government's intention to make Kashmir an international issue at any cost and will use its all resources to this end. Benazir Bhutto's appeal asking people to observe a strike for Kashmir has been so strong and effective that even her chief opponent Mian Nawaz Mohammed Sharif has announced his unconditional support for her. He has announced his decision to cooperate with the government to help make the government's strike plans against India successful. This will be the second most important strike after the Indira-Abdullah pact in which the whole government machinery will be joined by the joint opposition groups. After the 5 February strike and using it as a referendum, the government will find it easier to present a bill to nullify the Shimla pact in the Parliament. No internal or foreign efforts can be made to ask for Kashmir's total separation from India, its joining Pakistan, or becoming independent as long as the Shimla pact is there. That is why Benazir Bhutto has decided to follow her new policy.

*** Kashmir Liberation Force Established**

94AS0214C Karachi AMN in Urdu 8 Feb 94 p 3

[News Report: "Establishment of Kashmir Liberation Force Announced"]

[Text] Peshawar, 2 February (PPI)—Tribal leaders have decided to establish the Kashmir Liberation Force

(KLF) to give moral and material support to the Kashmiri freedom fighters. Mohammed Rouf Afredy has been appointed chairman of this force. He said at a Peshawar press conference today that under the KLF, that not only seminars and rallies will be held, but training will also be given to volunteers in countering serious situations. It is said that Rouf Afredy is the brother of Aurangzeb, who was the first martyr in Kashmir.

*** U.S. Attitude Towards Kashmir Problem Examined**

94AS0208B Karachi JANG in Urdu 9 Feb 94 p 2

[Article by Mohammed Gayur: "Has the Conscience of the Lone World Power Awakened?"]

[Excerpts] The international situation has been changing so rapidly and unexpectedly since September 1993 that we are dazed. President Clinton surprised the diplomats by mentioning Kashmir along with Somalia and Bosnia in his first address in the United Nations General Assembly. The astonishment caused by this announcement had not yet abated when Ms. Robin Raphel, assistant secretary of state, announced that the United States did not recognize the documents that Kashmir's Maharajah Hari Singh had signed merging Kashmir to India. This was followed by Prime Minister Narasimha Rao's congratulatory letter to Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto in which he had for the first time offered to discuss all the aspects related to Kashmir. At that time, the first impression was that the Indian Government was trying to move the situation created by the siege of Hazratbal to its advantage by offering to open negotiations. This could have been one reason for this action. However, if we review the developments during September and October 1993 and look at the statements issued by the U.S. State Department showing that the United States has been pressuring both India and Pakistan to resolve this issue by talks, the whole situation becomes a bit clearer. One reaction would be: God what is going on?

Until a few years ago, the United States was not willing to hear anything about Kashmir. Whenever, the issue was brought up, it was tabled by referring to the Shimla Agreement. Now it is so interested that it is considering Kashmir as one of the three major problem areas in the world and has put so much pressure to resolve this issue that foreign secretaries of India and Pakistan had to hold talks. Despite Madam Bhutto's direct statement that it is useless to waste time on meaningless talks, it is certain now that there will be additional rounds of talks between India and Pakistan even when they are meaningless.

What is the reason for this effort to win our friendship? Has the freedom struggle of occupied Kashmir pulled at the U.S. conscience? Their sacrifices definitely are enough to awaken any sleeping conscience. The occupied Kashmir has been facing devastation since January 1990

when the Kashmiris took up weapons. According to international news agencies, at least 16,000 persons have lost their lives. Front doors of hundreds of homes are knocked on at night and the young men there are arrested. Their bodies are given to a nearby police station the very next day. Many a virtuous young woman fall prey to gang rape by the Indian soldiers. Many unblossomed young women were trodden under the boots of Indian soldiers. These sacrifices could wake up even the most ruthless of hearts. However, did the conscience of the sole world superpower wake up because of these sacrifices? We wish it was true. Unfortunately, the conscience of a superpowers is controlled by its vested interests. What U.S. interests are related to Kashmir? [passage omitted on U.S. relations with China]

This difference in stand on international affairs is the main reason for enmity between China and the United States. Thus, if the United States manages to take the Kashmir valley and areas north of it under the U.S. control, then it will have succeeded in surrounding the newly liberated nations in Central Asia on the one side and China on the other side. In the ring around China, the Philippines in the east and South Korea are also U.S. allies.

Some of our analysts do not agree that the United States needs to put a ring around China and Central Asia. They believe that space intelligence or intelligence through satellites has made so much progress that the United States does not need Peshawar to monitor any country. It was 30 or 40 years ago when the United States needed Badber near Peshawar to set up a base to monitor the Soviet Union. The Pakistani government had very kindly given control of Badber to the United States from where the U-2 planes were used to take off to photograph Soviet air bases. Even Pakistan's president did not have the permission to enter that base. It was this base from where Gary Power's U-2 had flown when it was shot down in Central Asia. Khrushchev, then president of the Soviet Union, had drawn a red circle around Peshawar at that time. The situation has changed now. The camera mounted on satellites flying hundreds of miles in the space can take picture of not only air bases but also of bedrooms. Even the privacy of a closed room is not safe from these now. Why should they need a monitoring station on earth in this situation? This sounds logical, however, just like a rifle is the basic weapon of a soldier in this age of guided missiles and rockets, the importance of a land monitoring station has not diminished. Especially, for putting psychological pressure on the enemy.

What plan could the United States have to take control of Kashmir? Before considering this, we have to review two other incidents. [passage omitted on Pressler Amendment]

Thus, the mention of Kashmir by the U.S. President in his address to the UN General Assembly, Assistant Secretary Raphel's challenging Kashmir's ever having joined India, the possibility of ending the Pressler Amendment, and not including Pakistan in the list of terrorist nations are all events which need to be viewed

as in a series rather than in isolation. The purpose of these appears to be putting pressure on India and Pakistan to "flatten them."

There are two problems. One is to open up Indian and Pakistani nuclear installations for international inspection and the other is creating such a solution of the Kashmir problem that U.S. interests are served. If Kashmir remains in India, no India government, despite its enmity with China, will allow the building of U.S. bases. If Kashmir joins Pakistan, perhaps because of its traditional loyalty, Pakistan may agree to the United States demands. Even during the peak period of Pakistan-China friendship, the PIA [Pakistan International Airlines] planes were used for spying on China. It would be impossible to convince India to give the Kashmir valley to Pakistan. This approach would be very dangerous because of the fundamentalist groups in occupied Kashmir. If Azad Kashmir with some modifications is given to Pakistan, Jammu and Laddakh are given to India, and areas lying north of Kashmir become independent, the picture would be complete and this is what the U.S. option appears to be.

The problem is that both India and Pakistan find it difficult to accept this. India calls Kashmir its integral part. Pakistan has paved its way for connection with China through the northern region. Therefore, it would not be easy to convince either of them. However, if necessary, they should be forced to accept it. Even a very brief war between the two countries could exhaust their resources. Even after another Tashkent or Shimla pact, the United States will be very careful about it. President Clinton has received several jolts in his foreign policy implementation during the first year of his presidency. He had to recall the peace forces from Somalia. He has failed in imposing restrictions on weapons for the Muslims in Bosnia even after making several announcements to this effect. He has been unsuccessful in making friends in South America. Therefore, it is likely that he will think seriously before he takes another step. It took 13 years after the Camp David Agreement to hold conciliatory talks between Israel and the Palestinians. It appears that he will not take any hasty action. However, Kashmir is on the U.S. agenda, and it is the first time that it has been included in it.

*** Indian Attitude Towards Kashmir Said Leading to War**

94AS0208A Karachi JANG in Urdu 9 Feb 94 p 3

[Article by Nisar Ahmed Qaim Khani: "India's Attitude Towards Kashmir and the Possibility of War"]

[Text] The decision of Pakistan's Government to "try its best to raise the Kashmir issue at the United Nations" and to unmask India's atrocities at every forum is a correct and timely decision. Our prime minister is taking a step in the right direction by dismissing plans to hold direct talks with India. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto

said in her speech to the Kashmir Committee that she will not fall prey to any kind of expedient move. This dispute is a life and death issue for Pakistan and the government will use all its resources to resolve this issue according to the UN resolutions and the desire of the people. She told the nation, "No power in the world can stop us from helping the Kashmiri people. Kashmir is burning and we cannot leave it alone. We must stop the Indian atrocities. Kashmir is not only our heritage but also our history." She further said that Pakistan will give examples of human rights violations in occupied Kashmir to the UN Human Rights Commission. "I will present the case of Kashmir to the Human Rights Commission personally. Our efforts are aimed at making the world aware of this problem and wakening the world conscience." We know that at times the world opinion is full of double standards. However, we must continue our political, diplomatic, and moral efforts in this changing world. We are sure that in the long run these efforts will bear fruit and Kashmir will win its right to self-determination." The prime minister's decision makes it clear that the government is determined to talk about the Kashmir issue on every platform and its stand on this issue is correct, solid, and clear.

The year 1994 can be a very important year for Kashmir. This is the final round of struggle for independence in occupied Kashmir. All Kashmiris are willing to embrace death and the people are supporting the freedom fighters. This was related by U.S. correspondent Martin Sugarman after spending one month in occupied Kashmir. Despite strict restrictions on journalists in Kashmir by the Indian security forces, Martin Sugarman traveled the valley extensively as a tourist. He said that there is no other example in the world of what is happening in occupied Kashmir. The people are totally unarmed and have risen against the third largest military force in the world. No outside hand is behind this freedom struggle. He said that calling their struggle foreign interference is an insult to the Kashmiri people. He said that India was not willing to permit any human rights organization or journalists to observe its dirty game. He had gone there as a tourist and had to be very careful during his one month's visit there. Three Iranian journalists who were in occupied Kashmir as tourists were caught by the security forces. These three died during interrogation by the security forces.

A large number of British Parliamentarians assured their support for self-determination to the Kashmiris and ending Indian atrocities there. They have expressed their determination to raise the Kashmir issue in the Parliament. They had made this announcement while addressing the university where Sultan Mehmood Chowdhery, leader of the Jammu and Kashmir Liberation Front, works. Rogers Godsave, chairman of All Parties Kashmir Parliamentary Committee, has assured that 60 members of his committee will continue to support the Kashmiri people in the British Parliament. These statements make it clear that the whole world feels the need to resolve the Kashmir issue and the world

opinion is against the atrocities India is committing there. Even India's friend, Russia, has expressed a similar reaction. Russian President Boris Yeltsin had expressed concern over human rights violations in occupied Kashmir in a letter to Prime Minister Narasimha Rao and has asked India to solve this problem equitably. Even India's friends that support it over Kashmir are pressuring India not to delay an impartial resolution of this problem. The Indian security forces are involved in such hair-raising crimes as killing innocent Kashmiris, burning houses, and mass rape under the pretext of implementing the Public Security Act and the Terrorism Control Act. These incidents have shaken up the international conscience and are being condemned everywhere. All nations in the world and international human rights organizations are aware of this "Indian bestiality" and are raising voice against human rights violations and torture committed on Kashmiri people. Each passing minute sees increase in the volume in this voice. The whole world is aware and actively asking to accelerate efforts to solve this problem. Indian actions are condemned by the whole world. India cannot face this international pressure for long as India is already isolated in the international community. Even public opinion in India is changing. The thoughtful press there and Inderjit Gupta, a prominent Indian parliamentarian, have expressed their opinion against the Indian actions in occupied Kashmir. The Indian people have begun to question why are they fighting a losing war in Kashmir. The Indian people believe that their government's policy is not right. In addition, according to an Indian estimate, India is spending 180 to 200 million rupees per day in Siachen at a time when the people are dying of hunger on footpaths and streets. The Indian economy has deteriorated. The Indian armed forces have lost their fortitude and an army without fortitude cannot win. Therefore, India should forget that it can control Kashmir with the army for long. The sooner India agrees to resolve the Kashmir issue according to the UN resolutions, the better it would be for India itself. The present situation is very dangerous to India's internal stability and security.

Kashmir has become the worst example of atrocious actions and human rights violations. According to the reports issued by the Amnesty International, Asia Watch, and other human rights organizations, 30,698 Kashmiris have been killed between January 1992 and September 1993. Four thousand three hundred and eighty incidents of rapes have been recorded. Extreme torture has resulted in the death of 4,574 persons. In addition to this all, more than 40,000 persons are in various jails and an equal number is missing. However, the brave Kashmiris are still fighting.

The Kashmiri freedom fighters have opened a new chapter on 9 January 1994 in the history of their four year struggle. They attacked the radio system complex at the Avantipura airport in southern Kashmir and killed nine Indian airmen and officers. This was the first time that Kashmiri freedom fighters had entered a sensitive

military zone and returned without any casualties after killing nine Indian soldiers. High Indian officials and military officers were greatly perturbed by this incident. The Indian defense forces have declared this incident to be very threatening. According to news received from Jammu, the Kashmiri freedom fighters took a light machine gun, a sten gun, five self-loading rifles, and a wireless set from the Indian ordinance storage.

This incident is a new development in the struggle of Kashmiri freedom fighters and points to the new turn their efforts have taken. The Kashmiri freedom fighters have given a warning to the Indian government and high-level military officials through this attack on the Indian air base to stop crossing all the limits of atrocities, think about the consequences, and protect themselves from the vengeful activities of the freedom fighters.

India has also started "aggression" in the areas bordering Azad Kashmir. At the same time, it is threatening Pakistan with a war. This situation is dangerous for peace in South Asia and the international community should take immediate notice of it. It should not only increase pressure on India to resolve the Kashmir issue, but also announce through the United States, Russia, Great Britain, France, and other major world powers that economic defense and space air space restriction would be imposed against India. The Kashmir situation has reached a point where war between India and Pakistan could erupt any time. If this war starts, we cannot say what horrible results this continent and the world will face.

*** PML(N) Senator Denounces Bhutto's Kashmir Policy**

94AS0216A Karachi TAKBEER in Urdu 10 Feb 94
pp 37-39

[Interview with Raja Zafar-ul Haq by Irfan Siddiqui; place and date not given]

[Excerpt] [Siddiqui] You keep a very close eyes on foreign affairs, especially those related to the problems of the Islamic world. What is your opinion of the present situation in Kashmir?

[Zafar-ul Haq] Briefly, I would say that Kashmir is a living example of India's atrocities, Pakistan's mistaken policies, the unprecedented brave struggle of the Kashmiri people, the helplessness of the Islamic world, and the biased policies of the international community. There are 27 places in the world where human rights are being seriously violated. The deplorable fact is that 23 of these 27 places are populated by Muslims. Kashmir is the most prominent place among them. The present movement has resulted from Indian atrocities. India has gone to extremes in committing atrocities during the last four years. But it failed to crush the freedom struggle. I believe that since the partition of the subcontinent, the campaign in Kashmir has never been so widespread or powerful as is now. India has changed governors here three times during this period, and every new governor

has claimed that he would crush the movement in little time. Krishnarao said in an INDIA TODAY interview, "If I get three or four more months, I will break the backs of those who want independence." India is continuously increasing its military forces, but the more the number of Indian troops increases—and it increases along with atrocities—the stronger the independence movement becomes. Thousands of people have become the prey of bullets. Those in jail are being killed and tortured. Houses, shops, and villages are being burned. There has been a rapid increase in the incidence of rapes. The movement is still going on, and perhaps it will be impossible for India to crush it.

[Siddiqui] What can you say about the success of this movement?

[Zafar-ul Haq] I have no good expectations from India's treachery and stubbornness. It does not support resolving the Kashmir issue peacefully, by sitting around a table or by holding a plebiscite according to the UN resolution. We have learned over the centuries that when a community decides to break the shackles of slavery and is willing to make any sacrifice to do so, then no power can keep that community enslaved with military force and weapons. The sooner India understands this, the better.

[Siddiqui] Has there been any change in international attitudes?

[Zafar-ul Haq] As I mentioned earlier, Kashmir has gotten the world's attention by making sacrifices. Now CNN, the BBC, the Voice of America, and the Voice of Germany are airing news stories about human rights violations there. Last year (1993), the UN secretary general mentioned the situation in Kashmir in his annual report after a long time. The U.S. President also declared Kashmir a disputed area for the first time in his speech to the General Assembly. The countries that adopted a neutral stand have started to talk openly about the sacrifices of the Kashmiri people. But I would still say that the world's conscience has not bothered enough to put pressure on India and to force it to accept the promises made at the international level. In this context, Pakistan has an important responsibility.

[Siddiqui] Has Pakistan met its responsibility?

[Zafar-ul Haq] Unfortunately, I must say that the attitude of the present government on Kashmir does not reflect the desires of the people. This government is fixated on keeping India happy. The people of Kashmir have made great sacrifices and have worked tirelessly to present their case to the world. They have been successful in this effort. The concrete result of their efforts should have emerged, in the UN resolution in which the attention of the Security Council was brought to the Indian atrocities. This resolution had recommended that the Security Council visit occupied Kashmir and investigate the human rights violations there. The passing of this resolution would have been a major diplomatic defeat for India, and its true face would have been

unmasked to the whole world. During that period, there was also strong pressure on India from within, and after a long time, India found itself in a very troublesome situation. It had neither time nor any alternatives. It was coming to face the Security Council forum after many years. This was the time when Kashmiri Governor Krishnarao said he would "crush this movement" if he got three or four more months. India showed great skill in trapping Pakistan by initiating those meaningless talks. This was the failure of our foreign policy.

[Siddiqui] Do you think that there should be no talks?

[Zafar-ul Haq] In this era, anyone who refuses to hold talks loses the sympathy of the international community. There should be talks; however, the resolution about Kashmir should not have been withdrawn. If India refused to hold talks because of this resolution, then it would have been condemned. Now the Indian press is jumping with joy at the fact that because of these talks, India got new and unexpected relief, and our government, because of the people's pressure, is raising the slogan that we have not lost anything. We could have re-introduced the resolution any time we wanted. The next session of the General Assembly is scheduled for September 1994. How can we introduce the resolution again before that time? [passage omitted on foreign policy]

[Siddiqui] In your opinion, what kind of policy should we adopt on Kashmir?

[Zafar-ul Haq] Look! The first thing is, our stand should be clear and firm. We must have full faith in our stand. It is a simple fact that after the division of the subcontinent, the people of Kashmir, according to the agreed-upon formula, should have had the right to decide whether to join India or Pakistan by holding a referendum. The UN resolution has used the word "plebiscite." Later, the people added the right of self-determination on their own. The plebiscite should be held on the question of whether Kashmiris want to join Pakistan or India. The states of undivided India were presented with the same question. Confusing this with some other definition aims only at opening other options for Kashmir. Pakistan should know that there is no third option for Kashmir. In fact, there is no second option. There is only one option: the right to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir. At the same time, our government should present this case on the international level and provide the Kashmiris with more opportunities. This is not a question of India or Pakistan, but a question of the rights of 12 million Kashmiris. It is a human issue. Our present leadership puts forth nonsensical statements that confuse this issue even further. Recently, President Farooq Leghari said that Kashmir is the only hindrance to good relations between India and Pakistan. Some other politicians also have said the same. Kashmir is no hindrance to our good relations. The hindrance is caused by India and India only, which has an imperialist mentality and is very stubborn. It has spoiled relations with all its neighbors and is crazy about ruling others. Similarly, Benazir

Bhutto said, "The way we swallowed the bitter pill of East Pakistan, India should be ready to swallow the bitter pill of Kashmir." This statement is contradictory to the facts, and it weakens our case. Comparing Kashmir with East Pakistan is unrealistic and unwise. East Pakistan was part of Pakistan. It was never a disputed region. In contrast, Kashmir has been a disputed area from day one. The prime minister's statement means that she considers Kashmir part of India, the same way East Pakistan was part of Pakistan. After sitting in the prime minister's chair, making such foolish statements will lead to being ridiculed by the world. Kashmir is not a bitter or sweet pill for anyone, but a solid problem that is in need of a solution.

[Siddiqui] India still declares Kashmir to be an integral part of the nation.

[Zafar-ul Haq] This is nothing new. The imperialists always think in this way. They always call areas under their control integral parts. But with time, everything fell asunder. At one time, this subcontinent was also an integral part of Great Britain. America declared its independence when it was influenced by the French Revolution, and Britain's Foreign Ministry issued a statement asking all countries not to interfere. "This is an internal affair," they said. "America is an integral part." When the movement for independence was going on in Algeria, France also sang the same song. History tells us that wherever the lamps of freedom are lighted, this will be the first reaction of the imperialists. The Kashmir issue is totally different, though. India's claim is totally unfounded. The day is not far when Kashmir will be freed from Indian clutches. If India does not compromise on its "part," then all other parts of its body will be dispersed everywhere. [passage omitted on Bosnia]

[Siddiqui] You are the secretary general of Motmar Aalim Islami. Please throw some light on the services of this group.

[Zafar-ul Haq] The basic work of Motmar is to present the problems of the Islamic world properly and to get the people's support. We are paying special attention to preparing literature in this context. We published literature based on facts about Kashmir and the Babri Masjid crisis and distributed them during the foreign ministers' Islamic conference. Later, we sent this to diplomats all over the world. Last year, at the Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva, Motmar sent a deputation of Kashmiri women, which unmasked the Indian atrocities there. In June 1993, Motmar sent a group, in which I also participated, to the Human Rights Conference in Vienna. We sent Iqbal's poetry, in Persian with a Russian translation, to the central Asian countries. We also publish a weekly magazine which carries facts and news about the Muslim world. It is circulated in about 70 countries. Last year we sent medicines valued at 83,000 rupees [Rs] to Bosnia, and we have established a fund for Bosnian children. We donated Rs500,000 to this fund. Now we are sending Rs800,000 in aid to the Bosnian

people through UNICEF. The Motmar is also giving scholarships to 32 students, who are receiving educations in different countries. We have published books and pamphlets about problems in the Islamic world. [passage omitted on Afghanistan, Somalia]

* Efforts to 'Liberate' Kashmir Reviewed

94AS0214A Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 10 Feb 94 p 13

[Article by Mukhtar Hasan: "Progress Towards Kashmir's Independence"]

[Text] On 5 February, the people of Pakistan will celebrate to show their solidarity with the people of Kashmir, and will declare their firm demand that the Kashmir issue be resolved according to the UN resolution, by holding a plebiscite in Jammu-Kashmir. Since 1990, this is the fifth Solidarity Day to support Kashmir's struggle for freedom. It was started on the appeal by Qazi Hussein Ahmed, leader of the Tehriq-i Islami. Mian Nawaz Sharif's state government in Punjab and the Azad Kashmir government had announced their full support for it, and soon the Benazir government at the Center had to follow suit. As a result, 5 February has attained the status of Kashmir's national day. The first 5 February Day, in 1989, was in memory of the more than 200 unarmed citizens who were killed by firing in Indian-occupied Kashmir. This was the beginning of people's movement against the oppressor, India.

In occupied Jammu-Kashmir, this people's defiance movement has spread fully to 10 Muslim-majority districts out of a total of 14. These include all of the six Muslim majority districts in Kashmir; three of the six Muslim majority districts in Jammu; and three districts in Laddakh, one of which is a Muslim majority district. The three districts of Jammu—Udhampur, Kathua, and the Buddhist majority district of Laddakh—are not fully peaceful now. Thus, the city of Jammu itself is not free of this movement. The same situation exists in Udhampur and Leh. From these 14 districts, Kathua is the only one where the mujaheddin have not made any remarkable achievement toward freedom. District Doda in Jammu area, which is a Muslim majority district settled on both sides of the River Chenab, is very important because of its strategic location. It is also the center of the movement, just like the Kashmir valley. One can judge how serious the movement here is from the fact that during the Indian home minister's visit to this place, freedom fighters attacked the helicopters of oppressive India, in which the minister went to Doda. The Indian army had a hard time protecting its home minister.

These incidents and details explain the situation of the movement in Jammu and Kashmir. This fact is clear to India, the United States, which claims to be the leader of the world, and its ally and advisor in world affairs, Great Britain. In addition to massacres and ravages in Kashmir, they have ignored the resolutions ordering a plebiscite and are now starting the mischief called the "third option" in order to sabotage the Kashmir issue, which is

on the UN's annual agenda. This trick is actually encouraging the freedom struggle. India and the United States are looking for a way to make Amanullah Khan, who lives in the Gilgit district of northern Kashmir, the leader of all of Kashmir. The arrest and release of Amanullah Khan in Belgium recently was part of a game played by India and the United States. But Amanullah Khan's third option slogan and his own personality do not have enough clout to attract the people of Jammu-Kashmir toward themselves. None of the active organizations in occupied Kashmir agree with Amanullah Khan's "third option."

The third option is actually an Indian option because, in the arena of plebiscites, the Indian option has failed compared to the Pakistan option. It has failed so badly that one cannot find a Sheikh Abdullah or a Bakshi Ghulam Mohammed anymore. Further, even Farooq Abdullah, who served India as his father did for years, is nothing more than a political skeleton there. Thus, India is controlling this region with its armed forces, and India and its supporting world powers know that this kind of military occupation by spreading soldiers in every lane and village cannot be continued for many years. Therefore, these countries—the United States of America and Great Britain—have joined India and are trying to sabotage the freedom struggle in Jammu and Kashmir through the third option. The idea of the third option is so fallacious that when Amanullah Khan was recently asked why, after struggling so long to join Kashmir with Pakistan, he was talking about an independent Kashmir? Could he mention even one Hindu who had fought side by side along with the mujaheddin against the Indian army? Did the Hindu population ever join the freedom struggle, as the Muslim population did? In a situation when not even one Kashmiri Hindu has joined the struggle for independence from India, how can you establish an independent Kashmir? This third option seeks to divide the struggle for freedom and to put Jammu and Kashmir permanently under Indian slavery. The Muslims will be divided and will start to fight among themselves. The old imperialist formula of divide and rule is being labeled the third option in Kashmir. Amanullah Khan is talking in his naivete, or perhaps he wants to play the role of a new Sheikh Abdullah. This cannot remain hidden for long.

An independent Kashmir is just not possible. It would just become an imperialist base between China and the Muslim countries of south and central Asia. But this will be an even more artificial nation than is Israel, and it will have no ideological, geographical, ethnic, or religious coordination. The three regions of Kashmir, from the Sindh valley to Chalas, from the Kashmir valley to the Jammu hills and the semi-hill district, are all separate from each other. But each of them is bound to Pakistan. Jammu and Kashmir can survive only by becoming a state of Pakistan and part of Pakistan. It cannot become a separate country, just like Sarhad or Sindh could not because of the inner strife these areas face. Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, veteran leader of the Kashmir committee in the National Assembly, recently declared the

third option unrealistic and illegal. He said, "The people of Kashmir want to join Pakistan and Pakistan only. They are making sacrifices for this purpose, and Pakistan is their only goal."

At this time, despite all kinds of political differences in Pakistan, the Kashmir committee has formed a very strong platform here. This time, the strike on 5 February and the Solidarity Day to show support for Kashmir's freedom struggle are being organized under the Kashmir committee. This is the most appropriate opportunity to prepare this national platform for its next step in order to get independence for Kashmir. This is a good time, because there is a lot of interest in Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, who can help formulate and implement a national policy on Kashmir. Further, Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan is not suffering any delusions about the Kashmir issue.

The platform of the Kashmir committee should be made the focal point of the concerted effort of the whole Pakistani nation. This is a very important national issue, and it cannot be left on the government alone, regardless of which party leads it. In the context of this concerted effort, it is also important that everyone contribute whatever they can to this purpose. Madam Benazir Bhutto is trusted by the West, and her Western connections should also be used for this purpose. The Jamaat-i Islami has close relations with the freedom struggle in Kashmir, and it should be part of this effort. Mian Nawaz Sharif should spend all his energy on this goal. Other leaders of our country should mobilize the country's people and change world opinion at the political and diplomatic levels. They should try to make progress in whatever way they can and, under the Kashmir committee, make these efforts organized and powerful.

Instead of making the success of the 5 February strike a goal into itself, we should look forward to the goal of freedom for Kashmir. In this context, we have to make some decisions about this national platform among ourselves and within this country, and some of these steps will be external and at the international level.

The internal decisions are:

1. We must make Azad Kashmir the base camp for our freedom struggle. We have to establish unity there that is above political and group loyalties. It does not matter if there is the government of one-party or national government in Azad Kashmir; the government must be formed to reach our goals of independence. The Azad Kashmir government should copy the methodology employed by the mujaheddin.

2. To make the people part of the struggle for freedom, they should be given military training in Azad Kashmir and be armed. They should be given light weapons at the line of control so they can protect themselves. The armed people in Azad Kashmir will have the ability to respond to India's aggression. Only then can Azad Kashmir be the base camp for the independence struggle.

3. A united and potent leadership of independence movements should be encouraged in occupied Kashmir. This leadership will come from occupied Kashmir and not from Azad Kashmir. The leaders of the Pakistani government should not repeat their Afghanistan jihad mistake in Kashmir, and the formation of a political leadership for Kashmir should start now. In this context, one should rise above party loyalties and, at this point, Sayyed Ali Gailani, former opposition leader, can emerge as the sole leader in Kashmir. He should be considered the political leader of occupied Kashmir. By rising above political party loyalties and acting in the greater interest of Kashmir's freedom, a political struggle should start under his leadership. One should never even think that he is the leader of Jamaat-i Islami of occupied Kashmir and that therefore, Pakistan's Jamaat-i Islami will get credit. The question here is not of getting credit, but of freeing this region, without which Pakistan's existence cannot be protected or stabilized. When a person from a specific party is accepted at that level, he does not belong to that party. In our recent history of Pakistani politics, Maulana Mufti Mehmood is the best example of this process. We can all agree on Sayyed Ali Gailani. His sacrifices, continuous jailing, and political background have made him the only person in Kashmir whom everyone can trust. Now Pakistan and Azad Kashmir are also expressing an interest in him. He can be included in negotiations with India or with any international group as a representative of occupied Kashmir for its freedom. Until now, the independence movement in occupied Kashmir has been like a chicken with its head cut off. When the time for negotiations comes, we will need a leader, and that leader is Sayyed Gailani.

The steps to be taken at the international level are:

1. Muslim countries, especially Iran and the Gulf countries, must be made aware of India's expansionist designs. Pundit Nehru decided that the goal for India was to control from east of the Suez to the Pacific Ocean, or from Iraq to Indonesia. Every Indian government makes this its national goal and is moving toward this. An economic boycott of India over the Kashmir issue will be a big blow to its expansionist designs. Not only will the path for Kashmiri independence be paved within a few months, but also, India would be cut down to size. In the ocean of the Muslim world, it is the only non-Muslim country, and it cannot continue living there like a crocodile.

2. The moral support for Kashmir's struggle for freedom does not mean help in words only. The real moral support is the kind the Muslim world provided during the Afghan struggle for freedom. Kashmir is a disputed territory where India has led aggression. The people of Kashmir, under the UN charter, had a right to individual and group defense. This is the stand that the government of Pakistan, through the Kashmir committee, can publicize at the international level.

3. From human rights issues to UN resolutions, there are many items that can be used to change world opinion about Kashmir. The aggressor India could be defeated at every step with these points. It is imperative, however, that all political powers in Pakistan promise to work closely and cooperatively.

4. Preparations must be made to present this issue at the United Nations at the diplomatic level, and to pave the way for establishing peace in this region through a UN resolution. The goal should be to make sure that the international community has no other alternative but to follow up on the resolution passed in the Security Council.

5. The last aspect of this is that India, seeing its defeat in Kashmir, might start a war against Pakistan. India's past record also points to this. But India's military grasp is not powerful enough to make such a mistake. This is not 1987, when Pakistan was occupied in Afghanistan and the people there had not challenged its occupation of Kashmir. Still, if India makes this mistake, and if the Kashmir committee and the Pakistani government make preparations inside the country and at the international level, then India will not only be defeated badly, but the Indian union will also come asunder like the Soviet Union. The end of the Indian union is possible just like the end of the Soviet Union, because both were established unfairly and by force. After the British left, instead of making this a free subcontinent, it has become a skeleton of nations in the form of an Indian union. The situation is conducive to Kashmir's freedom, and if our government leadership still sees Kashmir's independence in the American plan, then it would be a major blunder. [couplet] You pit your hopes on idols and are disappointed with Allah/Tell me what else is infidelity?

*** U.S. Said Given Green Light For Military Bases in Kashmir**

94AS0218B Karachi JASARAT in Urdu 12 Feb 94 p 1

[Unattributed report: "Pakistan Agrees to Allow U.S. Build Three Military Bases"]

[Text] Islamabad (API)—Pakistan has made an agreement with the United States of America to allow it to establish three military bases in Siachen, Azad Kashmir, and occupied Kashmir, in exchange for resolving the Kashmir issue. General Joseph P. Hoover, during his recent visit to Pakistan, has also made a list of the possible locations for building these bases, and gave that list to Pakistan. The United States and Pakistan will sign this pact in March. This information was revealed by PULSE, a weekly English newspaper published in Islamabad, through information collected from intelligence agencies and diplomatic sources. The newspaper reported that the United States, after this agreement on building military bases, changed its policy on Kashmir, accepting it as a disputed region. The United States has included Gilgit, Balistan, Azad Kashmir, occupied Kashmir, and Jammu-Kashmir, as well as the Aksai Chin,

now under China's control, as part of the disputed region. The United States has decided to resolve the disputes of this entire region. The newspaper further reported that the intent of the United States in signing this pact with Pakistan was to end China's supremacy and control Central Asia, Iran, Afghanistan, and Pakistan's Islamic movements. Great Britain will also be used for this purpose. The Kashmir Press International, referring to the newspaper, said that the U. S. Central Command's commander-in-chief, General Joseph P. Hoover [as published], had visited Pakistan during caretaker Prime Minister Moin Qureshi's time. After Hoover's visit, high Pakistani government officials visited the United States and obtained more details about this plan. The decision on specific sites for these military bases, however, was made by General Hoover during his recent visit, when Benazir became prime minister. Hoover also gave a list of sites where the bases can be built. PULSE also revealed that a few days ago, a U.S. spy plane was hangered in the Islamabad airport for a few days. During that time, the plane made several flights and inspected the proposed sights. Both countries will sign an agreement on this plan at the end of March, and in the beginning of April, the United States will begin cooperating with Pakistan at the international level to resolve the Kashmir issue. According to the newspaper, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's recent reaction to the Kashmir issue was part of this plan, and she did this at America's bidding.

*** Kashmiri Militant Groups Reviewed**

94AS0213B Karachi JANG in Urdu 13 Feb 94 p 3

[Article by Irshad Mehmood: "Panorama of Militancy in Kashmir"]

[Text] The year 1993 will be remembered as an important one. During this year, while the freedom fighters won some glorious battles, they also faced heavy losses. They have to bear the misfortune of the martyrdom of their commanders. During the beginning of last year, India sent additional military forces to Kashmir. The leader of the Border Security Forces, Chander Prakash, made an interesting comment about the presence of these forces in Kashmir in an interview. He said that in the jungles and mountains, where even the sun's rays are not seen, our soldiers are busy in rebellion.

At the beginning of this year, Hizb-ul Mujaheddin's commander, General Shaib, was killed by the Indian forces in Srinagar. In addition, Nasir-ul Islam, leader of Jumiat-ul Mujaheddin; Maqbul Ilahi, leader of Hizb-ul Mujaheddin; and Shamash-ul Haq, the acting supreme commander, were also killed. All in all, the most important members of nearly all the freedom fighting organizations were either killed or arrested. These include: Khalid Gibran, Sajjad Ahmed Mir, Jaffar Jamali, Maulana Ilias, Jamal Afghani, Akbar Bhai and Abdulmajid Sheikh. Al-Jihad's commander-in-chief, Sheikh Abdulaziz, Muslim Mujaheddin's Master Ahsan Dar,

and Dukhtran Millat's leader Aasia Inderabi were also arrested at one or the other time.

In addition to the arrests and killings, the Indian armed forces started burning various areas in Kashmir to put additional pressure on the freedom fighters. Sopore is one region where everyone has rebelled against India for the last 45 years. A large number of freedom fighters are members of different organizations in this region. According to the Indian communications media, this area had become a "little Pakistan" that housed a strong camp of the freedom fighters during this movement. The hold of the freedom fighters on Sopore has been so strong that the Indian armed forces could never enter here. When they tried to attack Sopore at the beginning of the year, the freedom fighters not only made the military forces suffer heavy losses, but also took away their weapons and ammunition. Later, the mujaheddin had an exhibition of these weapons and ammunition which was viewed by thousands of people. Taking over Sopore became a major problem for the Indian forces. The top leadership of the army decided that instead of fighting the mujaheddin in Sopore, they would turn Sopore to ashes. Finally, on 6 January, they set this area on fire and cooled their fire of revenge this way. Yet, the people of Sopore began to help the mujaheddin even more, raising Pakistan's green flag over every house. The mujaheddin openly celebrated Pakistan's freedom on 14 August. The Hizb-ul Mujaheddin transferred the Pakistani flag to their headquarters in Srinagar. What is worse, even the prominent Indian magazine INDIA TODAY had to admit that Sopore is the capital of the pro-Pakistan group. The Indian forces, after long determined planning, decided that they would stop only after destroying Sopore. On the night of 26 December, the Border Security Force and other paramilitary forces joined the Indian army and attacked Sopore. About 150,000 soldiers surrounded Sopore and also received enforcement from the Air Force. Still, the mujaheddin counterattacked with strong force. As a result, the Indian forces had to retreat, and the defeated enemy, demonstrating its traditional "bravery," burned cities, towns, and mosques and crushed them under their tanks. Sayyed Salahuddin ordered the mujaheddin to vacate Sopore temporarily. The next day, dozens of mujaheds who had participated in the battle returned to the base camp in Azad Kashmir [Pakistan].

This movement was also hurt by the arrest of popular female leader Aasia Inderabi. She had organized Kashmiri women and supported the mujaheddin. The role the women are playing in this movement is unprecedented in the history of the freedom struggle.

Since 1989, several mujahed organizations have been active in Kashmir. These organizations have played an important role in this jihad and in organizing attacks on Indian forces. Among these organizations, the largest is Hizb-ul Mujaheddin. It follows a military structure and is the only organization that has influence statewide. Most of the activities in Kashmir are carried out by the members of this organization. In 1990, this group blew

up the original structure of the Wooler Barge, causing billions of rupees in damage to it. Similarly, in the last part of 1990, it led a successful attack on India's former core commander and governor's advisor General Zaki, in which he was wounded. Similarly, on 24 January 1992, Hizb blasted a bomb at the police headquarters in Srinagar. It took the jihad from the narrow confines of the valley to Jammu and Laddakh. In 1992, Shamsher Khan, a Hizb commander, controlled Doda for several hours.

The Hizb-ul Mujaheddin has invited mujaheddin from all over the world to Kashmir, welcoming them warmly on their arrival. They are declared "guest mujaheds." In addition to Azad Kashmir, mujaheddin from hundreds of other countries are guest mujaheds in Kashmir. The supreme commander of Hizb is Sayyed Salahuddin, who lived in Azad Kashmir for a few months in 1991. Indian military experts believe that if Hizb is removed from the military platform of Kashmir, things would be easier for India. The Hizb calls prominent Kashmiri leader Sayyed Ali Gailani its patron leader. At present, 70 percent of jihad activities are done by Hizb members. The Hizb has the honor of being the largest and best organized of the groups.

Liberation Front—It is true that the Front started militant activity in the valley. The Front got a lot of publicity when it abducted Rubiya Sayyed. This group was established by Ishfaq Mujeed Wani, Abdul Mujeed Sheikh, and Mohammed Yasin Malik. Except for Yasin Malik, the other two leaders have been killed. At present, the leader of the Front is Javed Ahmed Mir, while Amanullah Khan in Azad Kashmir is the chairman. The Front is composed of anti-Pakistan elements. Many of its leaders have declared Pakistan and India equal enemies of Kashmir. The Front took the political path instead of militancy. Therefore, it was not involved in any militant activity during the last year.

The al-Jihad is a sub-group of the People's League. The Muslim Janbaz Force and the Jihad Force are playing an important role in the Kashmir jihad. Prominent philosopher and politician Mohammed Farooq Rehmani and Sayyed Shabeer Ahmed Shah are the leaders of the People's League. These two leaders learned about fighting for Kashmir's independence from their cradles. Unfortunately, however, both of them went their separate ways because of mutual differences. The influence of this organization extends all over the valley; however, the Farooq Rehmani's group Janbaz Force is especially strong in Bandi Pura and Bara Mula.

In addition to these organizations, Ikhwan-ul Muslimoon, Alumar Mujaheddin, Jumiat-ul Mujaheddin, Tehrik-ul Mujaheddin, Harkat-ul Mujaheddin, Muslim Mujaheddin, and Hizb Allah are also active in the jihad efforts. All of these organizations support Islam and Pakistan.

These organizations agree on the following point for joining Pakistan: India is our common enemy; therefore, all efforts should be made to be free of Indian clutches.

A decision about Kashmir's future should be made according to UN resolutions, by holding a plebiscite. All have to agree to joining Pakistan and forming an Islamic government.

The real participants in the militant activity in Kashmir are those anonymous mujaheddin, whose names, deeds, and positions no one knows save Allah.

*** Beg Sees U.S. Push for Independent Kashmir**

BK1602013894 Peshawar THE FRONTIER POST
in English 14 Feb 94 p 10

[Quotation marks as published]

[Excerpt] General (Retd) Mirza Aslam Beg has further elaborated his theory about the 'encirclement' of China by the United States and the role of Pakistan and India are required to play in this programme. He had earlier expressed the view that an 'independent' Kashmir was being sought by Washington so that it could serve as 'spying post' against China within the grand strategy of 'encirclement'. According to him, the continuation in force of the Pressler Amendment was a victory of Jewish and Hindu lobbies against Pakistan. On the American insistence that India and Pakistan should normalise their relations, the general is of the view that the two South Asian states are sought to be brought together as a par to the 'encirclement' policy by Washington.

Needless to say, the retired chief of the army staff is saying things that people want to hear, given the political environment in Pakistan. Because there is such a uniformity of intellectual opinion in the country, some rules of debate are not being observed, somewhat like the one way debates shown on PTV. At the risk of being called Jewish agent, let us look at the views expressed by the general who, it must be said in all fairness, believes in debate. Would an 'independent' Kashmir be a good listening post against China when a much less isolated Nepal or even Pakistan would be available? What kind of 'listening' would Washington want in addition to the satellite surveillance it already has over China? Would it want to use Kashmir militarily when it has missiles that can be delivered effectively and probably more accurately from the Indian Ocean? [passage omitted]

*** Diplomatic Moves on Kashmir Seen Successful**

94AS0213A Karachi JANG in Urdu 19 Feb 94 p 3

[Editorial: "Pakistan's Diplomatic Success on Kashmir Front and India's Consternation"]

[Text] A spokesman for the Indian Foreign Ministry has threatened that if Pakistan carries out its plan to introduce a resolution in the UN Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva condemning India for violating

human rights in Kashmir, then the next round of talks between the two countries will be canceled. According to the spokesman, India is very disappointed by the Pakistani campaign against India.

Pakistan took back the resolution it presented in the United Nations when India expressed a desire to discuss the various disputed issues, including Kashmir; expressed its willingness to add the Kashmir issue to the agenda as a separate item; and some friendly nations had assured Pakistan of India's serious interest in holding developmental talks. This resolution was introduced by the former government with the cooperation of some friendly nations. When it was taken back, it did not mean that Pakistan had forfeited its right to introduce it in any other forum of the United Nations. Providing India an opportunity for some constructive talks was a step to prove to the international community that the main stumbling block to these talks is India's stubbornness. Thus, Pakistan initiated talks at the foreign secretary level in Islamabad at the beginning of January. Seeing India's negative attitude, however, we fought India's efforts to lengthen these talks. The opposition expressed anger and disappointment at our government's step and reproached the government. The government, however, had made it clear that if the these talks failed, it would raise the Kashmir issue at every regional and international forum.

At present, the situation is that Pakistan distributed a draft of the resolution among commission members, and its representatives are lobbying with representatives of other countries to pass this resolution. Russia, the United States, and Great Britain have expressed displeasure at India's attitude, and India is worried that on 25 January, when this resolution is introduced in the Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva, it will face failure and disappointment. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, Foreign Minister Sardar Asif Ahmed Ali, and some diplomats have raised this issue among the international organizations very effectively. Therefore, it is expected that this Pakistani resolution in support of the Kashmiri people's struggle will be approved. Thus, the struggle of the Kashmiri people will get the moral and political support of the international community.

The fact is that the present government has not shown any hesitation or weakness on the Kashmir issue. Instead, Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, after giving a decisive opportunity for some serious talks, and after their failure, has raised this issue during all her foreign trips and in front of various international agencies. The Indian government's reaction also proves that Pakistan's diplomacy on this front has been successful, and that they are threatened by it. They have come down to various negative and capricious actions. Keeping in mind the solid efforts by our government, we can expect that the Human Rights Commission will approve the resolution and that the international community will increase its pressure on India. That, in turn, will force India to involve itself in result-oriented talks with Pakistan. Its threat of canceling the talks will only prove to be

a false one. Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, in a speech in Lahore, expressed her support for the Kashmiri people's struggle for freedom. She said, "Pakistan supports the Kashmiri people's struggle for freedom and will continue to do so. We want to see the Kashmiri people free in the 21st century." There is no doubt that Pakistan is very busy supporting the Kashmiri people's cause on the diplomatic front; however, bearing in the mind the seriousness of this situation and the political ups and downs in this region and at the international level, we must ensure that our nation is united in action and thought. We lack this unity, and our weakness on the internal front can affect our efforts on the external front. Particularly in the National Assembly, the opposition's confrontation with the government, blocking the passage of laws, the making of flagrant accusations against each other, and starting a no-confidence campaign against the chief minister in the assembly have all created a situation that is unacceptable. All these are destructive incidents and keeping in mind India's attitude about the Kashmir issue, the Indian government's threats of war against us, and threats of some serious consequences all demand that we be fully united in our country to be effective in our foreign affairs. The nation demands that our politicians and leaders be aware of their responsibilities. Only then can we play a constructive role in making sure that the freedom struggle of the Kashmiri people is successful.

*** Commentary Urges India to Face, Resolve Kashmir Crisis**

BK2102084294 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network
in English 1600 GMT 21 Feb 94

[Commentary by A.B.S. Jafri]

[Text] Pakistan's latest note on Indian annexed Kashmir covers all the major issues and calls for the most urgent attention with the utmost earnestness. This communication handed over to New Delhi yesterday is a model of clarity, logic and reason. Inevitably, the core issue of Kashmir tops the agenda presented by Pakistan. If there is a sincere desire to restore peace and tranquillity to [words indistinct] state under Indian military occupation, Pakistan recommends four steps to be taken by India. First, face and accept the fact that the people of Kashmir under Indian control just would not accept it anymore. Second, the active and operational presence of over half a million crack Indian Army troops militates against the remotest possibility of peace. Third, the massive repression of civilian population is unacceptable not only to its direct victims, but also to world conscience. And fourth, reckless violation of the Line of Control keeps tension at an intolerable level.

It is for India and India alone to act to remove the clearly defined problems. These problems have their origins in New Delhi and New Delhi has to act to retrieve the situation, which is getting more and more complicated by the minute. Those who would expect to effectively divert world attention from Indian military action and

[word indistinct] rise in abuse of human rights ought to realize now that that (?trick) just did not work. India must change its direction and abandon the line which would only lead it into a sea of trouble.

Pakistan has taken up India's favorite theme of confidence-building measures. The six non-papers which the Indian Foreign Office had presented to Pakistan have been dealt with in detail in Islamabad note. About confidence-building, Pakistan points out the first and also the most convincing step in that direction would be a fair balance of forces in the subcontinent. It has recalled that this is what the United Nations defined as a prerequisite in its resolutions dating back to 1947. It made the best confidence-building strategy then; it does so now.

Pakistan and India should move toward hammering out a fair formula for balance of conventional forces and nonproliferation of the same. The Pakistan Foreign Office fails to understand what exactly is the connotation of India's suggestion for an agreement of nonuse of nuclear capability against each other. This doesn't make a great deal of sense because Pakistan cannot promise not to use nuclear capability because it doesn't have it. And it has not proposed to acquire it. So, that is that about nonuse of nuclear capability in the subcontinent. [sentence as heard] What Pakistan and the world community cannot forget however is that India is a nuclear power and if there is to be any promise about nonuse of nuclear capability in the subcontinent, it is for India to volunteer a categorical renunciation in this context.

On the Siachen flash point, Pakistan points out that India has made an incursion in the frozen [word indistinct] in disregard of the Shimla Agreement. The issue can be solved tomorrow if India traces its steps back to the appropriate point. The Sir Creek issue should cause no headache if only India would agree to refer it in an impartial international arbitration. As for the Wular Barrage issue, Islamabad has made note of the disappointing fact that India's non-paper does not address the real issue. But Pakistan is ever-willing to join talks with India on the subject as indeed on any subject of mutual interests and concern.

Pakistan emphasizes the fact that it agreed to wait for the non-papers which the Indian foreign secretary promised to provide during the secretary-level talks earlier this year. It was felt then in Islamabad that the non-paper's promise was to circumvent substantial talks on the core issue which is the future of Kashmiris under Indian control and military action. And it turns out to be exactly that the non-papers registered no progress on any issue. Waiting for them has put talks on the real issue back by so many weeks. Pakistan would like India to persuade itself that the facts of the situation in occupied Kashmir have now reached a point where they are unalterable no matter how much of military power and its deployment is resorted to.

*** Editorial Urges Change in Indian Attitude for Peace**

BK0603141894 Karachi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu
25 Feb 94 p 5

[Editorial: "Regional Peace and Security—India Must Realize its Responsibility"]

[Text] During their talks in Islamabad, Chinese Vice Premier Qian Qichen and Foreign Minister Sardar Asif Ahmad Ali stressed the need for maintaining the tempo of the existing bilateral cooperation to ensure regional security. The two leaders held in-depth discussions on regional peace and security, nuclear nonproliferation in South Asia, and other issues. They also expressed serious concern over the violations of human rights in Kashmir.

As far as the issue of regional peace and security is concerned, there is no denying the fact that the Kashmir dispute has led to Pakistan-India wars in the past, and the issue has now taken such a serious turn that it may lead to another war between the two countries. Therefore, for the establishment of peace in this region, the resolution of the Kashmir problem by granting their fundamental right to the Kashmiri people is highly essential. India, however, has never adopted a reasonable attitude toward any agreement, be it the accord for protecting minorities or conceding the right of plebiscite to the Kashmiris, or fulfilling the commitments made to the United Nations Security Council. India has always presented the facts in a distorted manner. There have been seven rounds of secretary-level talks, but every round has ended in a failure. Pakistan's sincerity is reflected by the fact that it has approached every round of talks with the hope that India will adopt a reasonable attitude, but New Delhi's objective, obviously, has been to buy more time to continue its oppression and atrocities against the Kashmiris. India has deployed more troops in occupied Kashmir after the latest round of talks with Pakistan.

On the nuclear nonproliferation issue, India has never given any encouraging response. Under these circumstances, it is the Indian Government's responsibility to change its attitude to establish real peace about which it has been carrying out hollow propaganda thus far.

*** Bhutto Warns of Islamic World 'Sentiment' Over Kashmir**

PM0103131994 London AL-HAYAH in Arabic 25 Feb 94
p 4

[Report by 'Abdallah al-Hajj: "Bhutto Asks AL-HAYAH: Will the Kashmiris Meet the Same Fate as the Bosnians?"]

[Text] Jeddah—Pakistani Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto has urged the international community to intervene firmly to stop the inhuman practices being committed by India against the people of Kashmir. She called on the Security Council to take a firm stand in this connection.

In a statement to AL-HAYAH before leaving Medina, Bhutto said that the international community has a moral responsibility to ease the suffering of unarmed civilians in Kashmir. Their plight is the same as that of other Muslims throughout the world such as the Somalis, the Bosnians, and the Burmese. She pointed out that Pakistan has urged international organizations to intervene for the recognition of the Kashmir people's right to self-determination. She accused the Indian Government of dithering on this issue in order to maintain its occupation of Kashmir despite the mounting opposition to Indian rule among the majority of the population. She said that "the genocide operations carried out by the Indian forces against the Muslim population coincide with the persecution of Muslims by the Hindus. These moves are a prelude to a plan to impose Indian hegemony on the region." She warned that the "apparent failure of the international community will charge sentiment in the Islamic world."

Bhutto stressed that her country was making global diplomatic efforts in support of the principles of human rights, regardless of the legal aspects, and in support of the principles of the Geneva Convention for the prevention of massacres and the punishment of perpetrators. She asked: "Will the people of Kashmir meet the same fate as the Bosnians, who are the target of premeditated liquidation?" She added that "the struggle of the people of Kashmir is based on the quest for freedom, which is a legitimate demand in all civilized societies." She reaffirmed Pakistan's moral and material support "for the struggle of the people of Indian-occupied Kashmir."

*** Foreign Minister Lauds Results of UN Kashmir Vote**

BK1003114994 Islamabad THE MUSLIM in English
10 Mar 94 pp 1, 11

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Addressing a press conference in Islamabad today Ministry for Foreign Affairs Sardar Asif said: "Iran and China have contacted Pakistan at the 'highest level' requesting it not to put its resolution on Kashmir for voting and have made some proposals."

"These are our close friends and we can't ignore their requests," he said. "We don't wish to ignore the suggestions of our friends who have stood by us altogether," he added.

Minister for Information and Broadcasting Khalid Ahmad Kharal was also present at the press conference and answered to number of questions by journalists.

Asif said Iran and China had asked Pakistan not to press for voting as of total 53 members of the Commission, about 42 or 43 have decided to abstain from voting but, "almost all of them had condemned human rights abuses in held Kashmir in their bilateral talks or at the floor of the commission. He said Iran and China might broker some sort of way out in this respect.

However, Foreign Minister said, "we have achieved our objective by tabling this resolution and we have succeeded in awakening the world opinion," he said.

Substantiating his contention, he said almost all the member countries had expressed their deep concern on the gross human rights violations being committed by Indian security forces in held Kashmir either in their bilateral talks with India or at the floor of the Commission. He said "we have succeeded" in compelling India to open up the held Kashmir for fact finding missions. He said a 11-member delegation was currently visiting Held Kashmir while one from European Community had already visited the valley, "though we do not agree with its report."

Information Minister mentioned the statement of American President Bill Clinton deploring human rights abuses in held Kashmir. He said European countries had also deplored the worsening human rights situation in held valley. "It is more than sufficient for us, it is great achievement of our foreign policy," he said adding never such a resolution was tabled by any government in the past. "We, at least, have the courage to table it," he maintained.

Quoting Finnish Foreign Secretary, currently visiting Pakistan, Shaharyar said that though his country would not vote for or against the resolution but "he told us actually Pakistan had achieved the objective by bringing this issue at frontline." "We have crossed a very important barrier, we have succeeded in making it a frontline international issue, now it is away from back burner," he added.

Sardar Asif said Pakistan would keep on raising Kashmir issue at all available international fora to draw the attention of world community towards worsening human rights situation in held Kashmir.

Responding to a question, Foreign Minister said Pakistan had not amended the resolution as reported in a section of the press. Elaborating the Foreign Secretary said some of the friends had suggested for some amendments in para 3 of the resolution calling for the sending of fact-finding mission to the held valley which had not been accepted.

Sardar Asif thanked Iran for helping Pakistan "achieve the breakthrough for Kashmiri people" and China and other countries who had made efforts either on the floor of the UNHCR Commission [UN High Commission for Refugees] or behind the scene. He appreciated that Iran, Australia, Columbia and Mexico emphasised that solution of Kashmir should be found. He said Australian representative had said he was fully aware of human rights violations in occupied Kashmir. He said it was noteworthy that the countries supporting Pakistan represented all the continents.

"The people of Pakistan can look forward to a successful Foreign policy of Pakistan run by the able leadership,"

he said. He congratulated Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto whose endeavour had led to the success of Pakistan.

* Kashmir Leader Demands Inquiry Into Arms Seizure

BK1003141294 Rawalpindi NAWA-I-WAQT in Urdu
10 Mar 94 pp 8, 4

[Text] Islamabad—Mumtaz Hussain Rathore, the former prime minister of Azad Kashmir and leader of the opposition in the Legislative Assembly, has urged the Government of Pakistan to set up an inquiry into the seizure of arms worth 20 million rupees by the Federal Investigation Agency and other sensitive organizations in Muzaffarabad. Talking to the NAWA-I-WAQT here on Wednesday, he said that the Muzaffarabad police led by the deputy superintendent of police and the director of the Civil Defense, raided the camp of the Al-Mujahid [a Kashmiri group] near Ziyarat Shah Enayat on Idgah Road and seized four truck loads of arms. The raid was conducted in the wake of a dispute between Sardar Atiq Ahmad, son of Azad Kashmir Prime Minister Sardar Abdul Qayyum Khan; and the commander of the Al-Mujahid over the payment of 8.7 million rupees and the government of Azad Kashmir has been keeping the people in the dark and wants to cover up the entire issue. Condemning this attitude, Mumtaz Hussain Rathore said we have been expressing apprehension about the designs and activities of the so-called Al-Mujahid. Such a large quantity of arms was stockpiled not for the cause of the Kashmir freedom movement, but for crushing the opposition in Azad Kashmir and the Government of Pakistan should have the entire situation investigated by its agencies, Rathore added.

* Radio Reports Reaction to Kashmir Geneva Vote 'Deferment'

BK1103025394 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network
in Urdu 0200 GMT 11 Mar 94

[Text] Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan, chairman of National Assembly Kashmir Committee, said that the Kashmiri people are determined to free themselves of Indian dominance. Speaking at a fast-breaking party in Muzaffargarh, he said the Kashmiris have risen against the repression of Indian troops and seek to achieve freedom. He said the Kashmir issue can only be solved through a plebiscite.

Nawabzada Nasrullah Khan said that he will call a meeting of the Kashmir Committee on the 20th of this month, which will be constituted of delegations to be sent abroad to mobilize world public opinion against the grave human rights violations in occupied Kashmir. According to APP, he said that he was not happy with the deferment of the voting on the resolution on Kashmir at the Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

Mohammad Nawaz Sharif, Pakistan Muslim League-Nawaz Group president, and Maulana Mohammad

Ajmal Khan, acting chief of Jamiat-i-Ulema-i-Islam, have also criticized the deferment of the Pakistan resolution on Kashmir.

Hamid Mufti, a member of Azad Jammu and Kashmir Council, has commended the efforts being made by Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto's government to raise the Kashmir issue at various international agencies. Commenting on the deferment of the voting on the Pakistan resolution on Kashmir at the UN Human Rights Commission, he said the objectives for moving the resolution have been achieved. He asked the political forces to commend the government's efforts due to which India has allowed a Muslim delegation to visit occupied Kashmir to investigate human rights violations. Pakistan Solidarity Front Chairman Nabil Malik has also commended the government's efforts due to which India has been forced to allow the ambassadors of Muslim countries, Amnesty International, and other human rights agencies to visit occupied Kashmir.

*** Opposition Calls UN Kashmir Vote Withdrawal 'Fiasco'**

*BK1003122394 Islamabad THE MUSLIM in English
11 Mar 94 pp 1, 11*

[Text] Islamabad, March 9—The Pakistan Muslim League PML(N) has strongly reacted to the withdrawal of resolution on Kashmir human rights situation from the Human Rights Commission in Geneva.

Chaudhury Sijjat Hussain, Vice President of the PML(N), while talking to THE MUSLIM on Wednesday evening termed it as a fiasco and said that the incumbent government had no accumen to handle the national issues and also lack commitment for the national cause.

"It is a black day in the struggle of Kashmiri people, who are rendering unprecedented sacrifices for their rights and have been stabbed by an unpopular government, he added. [no end quote as published]

Chaudhury Sijjat Hussain said that the PPP [Pakistan People's Party] Government had been blaming the Pakistan Muslim League Government for isolating Pakistan internationally but today it had been established that it was not the PML but the PPP Government that brought global isolation to Pakistan.

Gauhar Ayub Khan, Deputy Leader of the Opposition in the National Assembly, has also condemned the government for withdrawing the resolution and said that the Prime Minister should immediately step down as she had brought an embarrassment to Pakistan, which had no parallel in the history of the country.

He said that it was criminal negligence on the part of the government that a fit case of human rights violation of Kashmiri people had been destroyed by the government in Islamabad.

Gauhar Ayub Khan appealed to the patriot workers of the PPP to rise against the policies of the government

and act being above from the party politics. "I am sure now the whole nation has seen the true face of Benazir Bhutto's government", he added.

He announced that the opposition would give its official version about the fiasco on Thursday afternoon.

Mian Shahbaz Sharif, leader of the Opposition in the Punjab Assembly, while condemning the withdrawal of the resolution said that it had proved that Benazir government was engaged in patronising and helping out India.

"She is not prepared to lose any single opportunity to please India by playing with the national interests of Pakistan, which are no way dear to her," he said in a statement.

He said that track record of Benazir government had made it clear that as long she was sitting at the helm of affairs, the security of the country would remain in grave danger.

Mian Shahbaz Sharif appealed to the people to stand up against the "pro-India" government.

*** Bhutto Comments on Kashmir Human Rights Resolution**

*BK1603042294 Islamabad Radio Pakistan Network
in Urdu 0100 GMT 16 Mar 94*

[Text] Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto has said Pakistan will continue to raise its voice in favor of the Kashmiris who are waging a struggle to achieve their right to self-determination. In an interview with the Voice of Germany, she paid glowing tribute to the Kashmiri brethren for their just and valiant struggle, and pointed out that India has sent 600,000 troops to occupied Kashmir to suppress the struggle of the Kashmiris. The prime minister expressed the hope that India will not be able to suppress the heroic struggle of the Kashmiris despite all its military might.

Benazir Bhutto explained in detail her government's efforts to project the Kashmir issue at the international level, making particular reference to the gross violation of human rights in occupied Kashmir. She said the Kashmir issue has assumed international status as a result of Pakistan's efforts.

The prime minister disclosed that before the deferment of voting on Pakistan's resolution at the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva, India asked Iran to convey to Pakistan that it was ready to receive a delegation from the Islamic countries. Citing the actual reason for the postponement of voting on the resolution in Geneva, Bhutto said the voting was deferred because Pakistan was getting what it had planned to achieve with the resolution. She refuted Indian claims that the resolution has been withdrawn, emphasizing that the resolution is still effective; voting has been deferred on the condition that India allow delegations from Muslim countries to visit occupied Kashmir. If necessary, Pakistan will approach the commission and raise this issue again. This is the politics of conscience and principles, the prime minister added.